

JPRS 83680

14 June 1983

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 5, March 1983

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

14 June 1983

USSR REPORT  
TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 5, March 1983

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

## CONTENTS

New Document of Karl Marx.....	1
Yu. V. Andropov's Answers to Questions By a Pravda Correspondent.....	10
Mighty Instrument of Scientific Cognition and Revolutionary Action (A. Yegorov).....	14
Scientific and Technical Progress and Transformations in the Sphere of Labor (B. Rakitskiy).....	40
Components of Social Justice (V. Davidovich).....	53
Ethnic Processes in the USSR (Yu. Bromley).....	63
Latest Tasks of Soviet Geography (N. Agafonov, V. Anuchin, S. Lavrov).....	73
After All, Who Is the Frontranker? On Competition Conditions and Criteria (V. Cherfas).....	85
Consistent Internationalist (S. Belenkov).....	94
Outstanding Revolutionary and Thinker (V. Bogorad).....	102

Realistic Program for Curbing the Arms Race (A. Chernyshev).....	113
Material Prerequisites for the Social Homogeneity of the Socialist Society (N. Moskovchenko).....	126
Comprehensive Study of Foreign Economic Relations of Developing Countries (S. Iovchuk, Yu. Shiryayev).....	136
CIA and Western Europe (S. Golyakov).....	144
Short Book Review (Yu. Bochkarev, G. Starushenko).....	148



**PUBLICATION DATA**

**English title** : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 5  
March 1983

**Russian title** : KOMMUNIST

**Author (s)** :

**Editor (s)** : R. I. Kosolapov

**Publishing House** : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

**Place of Publication** : Moscow

**Date of Publication** : March 1983

**Signed to press** : 31 Mar 83

**Copies** : 856,000

**COPYRIGHT** : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1983

NEW DOCUMENT OF KARL MARX

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 3-9

[Text] The following is a fragment of excerpts made by K. Marx in 1844 from the writings of Pierre Lepaysan de Boisguillebert (1646-1714), a French economist and one of the founders of bourgeois classical political economy, entitled "Dissertation on Wealth, Money and Taxes." The work was included in the 1843 book "Financial Economists of the 18th Century" by E. Dair, the French economist (the first edition of Boisguillebert's book was published in 1707). In addition to excerpts from this work, Marx included in his notebook excerpts from two other books by Boisguillebert ("A Detailed Description of the Situation in France" and "Treatise on Nature, Soil cultivation, Trade and Usefulness of Grain") and from John Law's "On Money and Trade."

Marx added extensive comments to the extracts. This applies to Boisguillebert's work and Dair's polemical statements on which Marx made copious notes.

In his study of Boisguillebert's work, Marx also expressed critical remarks on the views of other bourgeois economists as well, such as Say, Ricardo, Mill and Malthus, whose theories he began to study at that time.

Marx began systematic work on problems of political economy after he was forced to leave Prussia and move to Paris in the autumn of 1843. By then he was already developing his materialistic and communist outlook. In the spring and summer of 1843, in the course of his critical analysis of Hegel's philosophy of law, unlike Hegel he reached the conclusion that it is not the state that shapes the civilian society but conversely, it is the civilian society (i.e., the realm of economic relations above all) that shapes the state. The anatomy of the civilian society should be sought in political economy. Therefore, in order to learn the laws governing the motion and development of the economic foundations of society it becomes necessary to study political economy. To this purpose, Marx undertook the study of the works of Say, Scarbeck, Smith, Ricardo, Mill, McCullough, Destut de Trassy, Boisguillebert, Law, Schutz, List, Oslander and others. One of the Paris-dated notebooks containing Marx's political economy excerpts also includes a summary of Engels' work "Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy."

In Paris, together with A. Ruge, Marx undertook the publication of the "German-French Yearbook." It was during that time that his conversion to materialism and communism was completed.

In the summer of 1844, Marx attempted to summarize the initial results of his economic studies and to provide a scientific substantiation of his communist outlook in his "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts." This work by the young Marx focuses on the problem of private ownership as the basis of bourgeois economy and society. On the basis of this analysis Marx intended to study all categories of capitalist production. He pitted against private property and the alienation of labor the need for their revolutionary elimination and the creation of a truly human society.

Many of Marx's views on the subject of Boisguillebert's book cited below agree with the views expressed in the "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts," particularly as far as private property is concerned. It is the basis for production and trade in bourgeois society. Marx proved that production and trade in bourgeois society have been dehumanized and are based not on human need but on private acquisition.

It was precisely Marx's critique of private property that explains the reasons for the special attention he paid to Boisguillebert's book, for his works contained "the first decisive criticism of...money," as embodied in private ownership relations. Indeed, Boisguillebert was among the first to criticize mercantilism and money, believing that the wealth of the nations is contained not in them but in products, mainly agricultural ones.

Boisguillebert was one of the founders of the labor theory of value. He believed that the appearance of money distorted the true nature of labor as a source of value. He therefore proposed that the power of gold and silver be abolished and replaced by paper money. In his view, in order to abolish the power of money its function should be reduced to a simple tool for trade.

Boisguillebert distinguished between price and "true value." He considered working time a measure of the value of goods. However, he confused labor materialized in the barter value of the commodities and measured in terms of time with live labor. He assumed that economic development is helped by free trade through which goods acquire their "true value."

The attention Marx paid to this problem confirms his interest in the theory of value. He set a high value to Boisguillebert's contribution to the theory of money and its circulation. In the initial draft of "Das Kapital" -- the 1857-1858 economic manuscripts -- referring to the excerpts a fragment of which is published below, he noted: "....See striking excerpts in my notebook" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], part I, p 179). Later, in the first edition of "On the Critique of Political Economy" (1859) Marx pointed out that classical political economy "begins with William Petty in England and Boisguillebert in France and ends with Ricardo in England and Sismondi in France" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, p 39).

As the text below shows, Marx was interested in the parts in Boisguillebert's book in which he discussed the development of commodity-monetary exchange which, in the final account, contributes to the development of capitalist relations. It was precisely in this that Boisguillebert saw the solution of many problems facing the society of his time, the ownership of the surplus of products by an insignificantly small social segment, although needed by the

population's majority, in particular. In connection with the study of these views, Marx looked at the problem of overproduction and its interpretation in the works of later bourgeois economists. Thus, Say explained overproduction in some economic sectors in terms insufficient commodity-monetary exchange. Marx puts forth the idea that the reason for overproduction is rooted in the very nature of capitalist production.

The present manuscript is a specific stage in Marx's study and critique of bourgeois political economy. It is characterized by the fact that Marx began paying increasing attention to the study of value which, at that time, he closely related to the study of overproduction crises, i.e., periods during which commodities become depreciated or, in Marx's words, lose their value. Marx tried to determine within the period under consideration the internal contradictions in the theories of bourgeois economists. These theories did not deny that bourgeois society was polarized into poverty and wealth but showed no understanding of the real reasons for this. Marx's particular approach to this phenomenon was that he proved that the contradictions in bourgeois society are the consequence of the alienation and private ownership which ruled it.

In this connection, Marx criticizes in his manuscript the views of bourgeois economists Say, Mills, Ricardo and Malthus. Thus, like many other bourgeois economists, Say bases his study of simple commodity exchange on the false premise of consistency between supply and demand under the conditions of a bourgeois society and denies the possibility of general crises under capitalism. Marx criticized this view subsequently, in the course of writing "Das Kapital," above all in the 1857-1858 economic manuscripts (see op. cit., vol 46, part I, pp 404-405), and "On the Critique of Political Economy" and the 1861-1863 economic manuscripts.

It is indicative that whereas in Marx's summary of Mill's "Foundations of Political Economy" (probably written sometime in the autumn of 1844) Marx does not comment on the author's considerations on the consistency between supply and demand, although comments are found in the manuscript. Marx looks at demand not in general but in terms of solvent demand. He claims that "The limit of demand is set by private ownership." The concept of need is also made more specific in said manuscript.

As to the summary, Marx not only proves the conflicting nature of the theories of Say and Malthus but blames bourgeois political economy for its effort to explain economic contradictions in some countries as a result of the influence of the world market.

Marx's manuscript is bilingual: The source is summarized in French while the comments are in German. Marx's manuscript is kept in the archives of Amsterdam's International Institute of Social History. It was initially published in 1932 in the original language in part one of the third volume of the first MEGA (Marx-Engles Gesamtausgabe) edition. A new edition is being currently prepared by the MEGA as a section of the fourth part of the third volume.

The translation is based on the refined interpretation of the previously published manuscript. The figures in parentheses indicate the page number of Marx's excerpts notebook.



The publication was prepared by I. K. Antonova and A. G. Syrov, scientific associates at the CPSU Central committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

K. Marx

Fragment of the Summary of the Work by Pierre Boisguillebert "Dissertation on the Nature of Wealth, Money and Taxes"

(12) "An ecu in the hands of a poor man or petty merchant is 100 times more useful or, rather, yields 100 times more income than in the hands of the rich man because of its constant daily circulation in which this small amount of money becomes involved. Things are different in the case of the rich man, in whose chest far larger sums remain unused and, therefore, useless for months and even years either because of a rotten character or, blinded by stinginess, in the expectation of a better deal," p 419<sup>1</sup>.

Boisguillebert further claims that 1,000 thalers in the hands of 1,000 poor men would bring the state 10 times more income than in the hands of a large owner, because of their thousandfold greater circulation and, consequently, consumption. As Dair accurately points out, in this case he erroneously treats exchange and "monetary circulation as a value-creating fact."

From the strictly economic viewpoint Dair is absolutely right as far as Boisguillebert's first assertion is concerned.<sup>2</sup> A thaler, whether owned by a poor or a rich person is worth one thaler only.<sup>2</sup> "Its value does not increase or decrease by becoming the possession of either one of these citizens." Dair is also right when he claims that "an ecu as capital contributes to the extent of its worth to supporting social productive labor" also when applied to Boisguillebert's claim that "an ecu owned by a poor man yields to the state more than one ecu owned by a rich person because it always means income for the former and frequently capital for the latter." However, unlike the old economists, the modern ones are right if only because the former had not as yet reached the understanding that value and income are essences in themselves<sup>3</sup> and have nothing to do with man. It is clear<sup>4</sup> that to both the poor man and the state, since the existence of the poor man<sup>4</sup> is part of the resources of the state, a thaler represents a greater value than to a rich person. Modern political economy, however, knows that one thaler is nothing but one thaler.<sup>5</sup>

"I repeat once again that the question is not to act for the sake of acquiring very great wealth but only of terminating all activity in general." P 420.<sup>6</sup>

The doctrine supported by the modern political economists is that of laissez faire, laissez aller. To both them and Boisguillebert the natural course of things, i.e., the dynamics of bourgeois society should put everything in order. According to Boisguillebert and, later, to the physiocrats, this theory has also something Human and Significant and Human, unlike the economy of the old state which tried to replenish its treasury through most unnatural means. It was significant as an initial attempt at the emancipation of civilian life.<sup>8</sup> This life had to become emancipated before a description of its nature could become possible.

"One thus realizes the terrible error of mistrusting the generosity or prudence of the goddess (nature) which can grant huge wealth to even the most sterile country rather than to people who rely on it for harvesting the fruits of their labor" (p 421).

Boisguillebert describes the depreciation of precious metals and money as the restoration of the true value of goods:

"The goods themselves will regain their true value,"<sup>10</sup> p 422.

He was unable to see at that point that the very exchange based on private ownership and that value in general deprives both nature and man of its "true value." To him "restoration of true value" meant restoring the commercial value of goods. What is important, in any case, is that the first decisive criticism voiced of gold and silver and, since they represent money, of money as well, opposed the depreciation of man and, consequently, the depreciation of the nature (13) of the products<sub>11</sub> of human toil. Such an ideal scholastic value destroys their actual value.

"One can confidently say that universal wealth....is a universal and general totality within which every one must work steadily and the result of which is the perfect totality in which everything is available, for everything is contributed through labor (compare this with the early A. Smith<sup>12</sup>). However, the moment someone undertakes to violate this principle of justice for the sake of taking more or contributing less than his share, mistrust and a violation of (the proportion) of money take place. The majority of people would become corrupt and would be forced to take special measures which would cause bitterness and would be almost always criminal or, most likely, both," p. 422.

"Money is the foundation of wealth only in Peru, for here it is the country's product," p 422.<sup>13</sup>

"The result is that if a ruler, abusing his power,...were to chain some 10 or 12 (of his subjects) at 100-foot intervals, leaving the first one stark naked in bitterly cold weather but with an incredible quantity of meat and bread, tenfold what he could consume before dying, which would happen quite quickly, as he would have nothing else, including liquids..; the second would be wearing 20 coats but would be left without food; the third would have only plenty to drink, etc. After their inevitable death one could see quite accurately...that all of them died of hunger, cold, and thirst, lacking liquids, bread, meat and clothing. Nevertheless, it is equally clear that, jointly, not only did they have clothing and food aplenty but that they could have even been well clothed and fed with no particular difficulty," p 423.

In explaining scarcity within abundance as the result of inadequate exchange of products and the consequent insufficiency of production and production consumption, Boisguillebert proves absolutely nothing, and so does Say, who explains overproduction with his theory of marketing.

Like all political economic theories, Say's theory is false.<sup>14</sup>



According to Say there can never be overproduction; if there is no market for a commodity, the sole reason is the insufficient production of a bartering equivalent (in the same or another country).<sup>15</sup> However:

1. Say, like Mill and Ricardo after him<sup>16</sup>, recognizes that overproduction may take place in a specific production sector; consequently, since in a specific country it is always a question of specific products, this could occur regardless of the means of production; the culprit is the unconscious nature of the production process, i.e., precisely the fact that it is not human but takes place under the conditions of alienation and private property.

2. Let us assume the most favorable case for Say. All countries should produce as much as possible and have the largest possible amount of bartering equivalents. Say forgets, however, that private ownership sets the limits of demand. For example, if France were to produce a small amount of shoes millions of people would walk barefoot. Overproduction would occur the moment more shoes are produced than there is solvent demand (14). What applies within one country applies in relations among different countries. If, for example, France produces as much wine as it can and England as much cotton as possible, and if the same situation would prevail with all countries, then a) French wine would be traded for English cotton to the extent to which in both England and France there would be people who can pay for the wine and the cotton. In other words, private property produces for private property. Therefore, production can exceed demand despite the fact that both countries show surpluses of reciprocal equivalents, since the need for wine and cotton or for any other product has a specific limit; on the other hand this limit is set by the number of people for whom this need is real, i.e., who can afford to pay for its satisfaction. Therefore, production will exceed not only a specific measure defined by human needs but a specific measure as defined by a small specific number of solvent people.

Regardless of how Say broadened the range of production or increased its variety ad infinitum, among this entire variety of products man, who owns them in a greater or lesser volume, will exchange them only with another man who also has some products and whose needs are limited. Therefore, products are traded not simply for other products but for products as private property.

b) In the most favorable case, because of their extreme abundance the products will depreciate. However, their production costs have a limit. If producers want to trade as heavily as possible, they must sell to customers who would pay less than production prices.<sup>17</sup> In other words they must give rather than sell their goods. The bottom limit for a sale is production cost plus a minimum profit markup. Therefore, a prerequisite for large-scale marketing is not for the other party to produce as much as possible but for the largest possible number of people to own products for trade, i.e., for everyone to be rich, although even then overproduction<sup>18</sup> could still exist, something which at present, naturally, is not the case.

Political economists are not astonished by the fact that a given country may have a surplus of products although the majority of its people are in extreme need for basic means of survival. They know that relatively widespread and, if possible, mass poverty is a prerequisite for wealth. And still they are

surprised -- they who produce not for the sake of people but of wealth -- by the fact that the wealth itself turns out to be valueless or, in other words, that products find no market and, therefore, have no equivalency or value. Although production takes place as something counter to the majority of mankind, they are surprised by the fact that it could become too large for an insignificant solvent part of mankind. They try to avoid the contradiction which exists between the output of an entire country and the number of people for the sake of whom this production takes place -- the hostile shunting of the majority away from production results and the conflict between production and the existence of a production process within the country for the benefit of man -- by involving relations among several countries, as though on a higher level the relation would change, the conflicting nature of production would disappear and, finally, many countries, as they exchange their products, would trade under conditions different from the same old contradiction which exists in their own country.

In general, the greatest wealth would be the greatest poverty to the political economists, for it would deprive objects of their value.

(15) The political economists fail to understand the fact that commodities must lose their exchange value for the reason alone that their barter value is their only value.

3. What is very strange is that Malthus, who admits to population overproduction, claims, contrary to Say, that the overproduction of goods is possible and that it is unfortunate.<sup>19</sup> It is precisely in this that the nature of such overproduction becomes clear. That same political economist claims that people reproduce faster than there are goods and that more commodities are produced than could be sold or should be produced.

4. Overproduction means depreciation of the value of wealth itself precisely because wealth as such should have a value.

If too much is produced for the sake of stockbrokers and capitalists, the surplus may depreciate the goods. Surpluses may appear on all sides, which cannot be traded, for they would exceed the needs of solvent people. However, the dynamics of private ownership demands overproduction despite and through universal poverty (Production itself produces universal poverty. Consequently, the market shrinks with every new impoverished individual. It is true that the liberal political economists realize that the monopolies put the individual within a framework which makes the exchange of products possible.<sup>20</sup> However, they fail to see that this is accomplished by private ownership as well). As production grows marketing declines, for the number of people deprived of ownership increases. Wealth inimical to man should lead to its loss of value to private ownership, acting as its own poverty and stopping to generate wealth. Products have a value only if there is demand. In the economic sense demand should decrease thanks to industry. The mass of products should grow relatively and, consequently, increasingly exceed demand, i.e., lose its value. The result is that production is not for the sake of society but for a social segment and it is to this segment that production should lose its value, for its own bulk would destroy it in the case of the small number (of people) belonging to this segment.

"The striving of people for wealth at the cost of destroying it leads to the vanishing of money which they hide in their effort to own it despite the laws of nature; this is exactly like collecting taxes through means which deprive the people of the possibility of paying such taxes by inflicting upon them losses which exceed tenfold or twentyfold the size of planned revenue," p 424.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Here and subsequently Marx's excerpts are from the work by P. Boisguillebert, "Dissertation on the Nature of Wealth, Money and Taxes." In "Economistes financiers du XVIII-e siecle. Precedes de notices historiques sur chaque auteur, et accompagnees de commentaires et de notes explicatives, par M. Eugene Dantire" (18th Century Financial Economists. Preceded by Historical Notices on Every Author and Accompanied by Comments and Explanatory Notes by Mr Eugene Dantire). Paris, 1843. Boisguillebert's work was written between 1697 and 1707.
2. In Dair: "One ecu in the possession of a poor or a rich man has no more and no less value than one ecu" (p 419). Here and further in his presentation of the French text in German and in his comments on it Marx changes "ecu" to "thaler," an equivalent monetary unit.
3. Of a nature for itself -- a Hegelian philosophical concept used here by Marx to indicate the alienation of the value of objects from the man who creates them. In developing subsequently the concept of the alienation of the value of objects from man, Marx arrived at the concept of commodity fetishism.
4. Without striking it out, Marx wrote over the word ("poor man") the word "man." In other words he retained in his manuscript both variants: "The existence of the poor man" and "the existence of man."
5. See K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 46, part I, p 306.
6. A reference to Boisguillebert's criticism of the fiscal system. The quote was marked off by Marx on the margin twice.
7. Laissez faire, laissez aller (passer) (literally: "let it work, let things move their own way") is a demand for free enterprise and noninterference by the state in economics. It was shared by Boisguillebert, the physiocrats and other representatives of bourgeois political economy.
8. Refers to the free development of bourgeois production relations and their freedom from the chains of feudalism (see also K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 1, p 404).
9. The clarification "(Nature)" is an insertion made by Marx in German.
10. True (just) value ("la juste valeur") is a concept in Boisguillebert's economic system. It defines working time proportionally distributed through free competition among individual production sectors (see also K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, pp 40-42).

11. On Boisguillebert's criticism of money see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, pp 41, 107-108, 128; vol 46, part I, p 143; part II pp 410, 430-432, 471; also compare with vol 42, pp 18-19, 109.

12. Reference to Marx's extracts during that time from the French edition of A. Smith's main work "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," (Paris, 1802). See among others MEGA<sup>2</sup> IV/2, pp 337-338.

13. In his criticism of precious metals in their monetary manifestation, Boisguillebert excluded countries in which such metals are extracted.

14. Marx further criticized bourgeois theories which denied the possibility of universal overproduction crises in his economic manuscripts, in "Critique of Political Economy" and "Das Kapital" (see in particular K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 13, pp 79-81; vol 23, pp 123-124; vo 24, pp 87, 566-567; vol 26, part I, pp 223, 261; part II, pp 520, 548-549, 552-558, 560-561, 569-570, 572, 575, 583-584, 586-594; part III, pp 45-48, 50, 52, 99, 120-123; vol 46, part I, pp 388-391, 404-405; and vol 47, p 106).

15. J.-B. Say. "Traite d'economie politique, ou simple exposition de la maniere dont se forment, se distribuent et se consomment les richesses" (Treatise on Political Economy). Vol I, Chapter 15, Third Edition, Paris, 1817. Marx studied this book in Paris in 1844. Excerpts from Say's work were published in the original language (see MEGA<sup>2</sup> IV/2. Pages 301-327).

16. J. Mills. "Elements of Political Economy," Paris, 1823, pp 253-258. For Marx's excerpts from Mill's work on this question see K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 42, pp 37-39.

D. Ricardo. "The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation." Second Edition, Paris, 1835.

17. Here Marx uses the term "price of production in the sense of "production costs."

18. Reference to the overproduction of goods in the sense of their surplus in terms of needs in general.

19. In 1844 Marx was familiar with Malthus' theory only as presented by other authors, Ricardo in particular (see MEGA<sup>2</sup> IV/2, p 426).

20. See MEGA<sup>2</sup> IV/2, p 424.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11



YU. V. ANDROPOV'S ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS BY A PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 10-13

[Interview published in PRAVDA on 27 March 1983]

[Text] [Question] On 23 March President Reagan made an extensive statement on problems of U. S. military policy. How do you assess it?

[Answer] Of late a flood of speeches has been pouring out of Washington on a single topic: Military preparations, military programs and development of new types of weapons. This is what the President spoke about once again.

The President's speech in question was clearly an effort to influence the mood in the United States and calm the growing concern felt in the country at the administration's militaristic course. Naturally, it is the Americans' business the way they assess the President's statement.

However, what the President spoke about does not affect the Americans alone. The essence of the speech is that America must rearm intensively and become the dominating military power in the world. The wish to substantiate these hegemonistic aspirations involves such shameless distortions of Soviet policy and dirty methods that, frankly, the question suggests itself as to what are the President's views on standards to be maintained in dealing with other countries?

To listen to the President, it appears that the United States is weaker than the Soviet Union here and there and even close to home. And all of this because over the past 2 decades the USSR has been allegedly increasing its armed forces at a faster pace while the United States, it is claimed, sat idly by while its armed forces declined.

Yes, the USSR was strengthening its defense capability. Faced with feverish U. S. efforts to develop military bases close to Soviet territory and its development of increasingly newer types of nuclear and other weapons, the USSR was forced into it in order to terminate American military superiority after which Washington is so greatly yearning today. The military-strategic parity which was achieved deprived the United States of the possibility of blackmailing us with the nuclear threat. This parity is a reliable guarantee for peace and we shall do everything possible to maintain it.

Only naive people could accept the claim that over the past 20 years the United States has done nothing. Let us turn to a few most important facts for confirmation.

It is known that it was precisely during that period that a sharp qualitative change occurred within the American strategic forces. Suffice it to say that the United States converted to multiple ballistic missile warheads. It did this despite our persistent appeals not to do so in order to prevent the start of a new round in the missile arms race. If the President were to take the trouble to consult the file of the talks he would easily see that such was precisely the case.

The results can be clearly seen by the fact alone that as a result of such a rearmament a single missile carried aboard an American submarine gained the possibility of hitting 14 targets simultaneously. Each submarine carries 16 such missiles the total striking power of which is the equivalent of nearly 500 atom bombs of Hiroshima power.

As a whole, during this interval of fictitious inaction on the part of the United States the President speaks about, the number of nuclear warheads in U.S. strategic armaments increased from 4,000 to more than 10,000. Could such an increase in the nuclear arsenal by a factor of 2.5 be described as inaction? Not in the least.

Now as to Europe where, according to the head of the White House, the situation of the United States and of NATO in general is equally difficult. But if we were to consider the facts we would easily see that the overall number of American nuclear armaments here tripled within that same period and currently exceeds 7,000 units. Is this the result of inaction too?

The President makes it appear as though almost 1,000 medium-range U. S. and NATO nuclear missiles are not deployed in Europe, as though he did not know that in terms of the sum total of nuclear warheads NATO does not enjoy a 50 percent superiority over the USSR.

Not content with avoiding all this, the President makes the patently untrue claim that the Soviet Union is violating its announced moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles.

He also avoids mentioning the fact that the American medium-range missiles are deployed literally at our doorstep. From this viewpoint, we fail to see the difference between them and the strategic missiles located on U. S. territory. This does not apply to Europe alone. Many hundreds of American missiles which could deal nuclear strikes on our territory are massed along the entire perimeter of the USSR. According to officially announced Pentagon plans the number of such carriers would be increased manyfold. More than 12,000 long-range cruise missiles alone will be deployed.

The President showed photographs of a civilian airport in a Latin American country, contriving to present this as another threat to the United States. He failed, however, to show photographs of the hundreds of take-off strips



thousands of miles distant from the United States on which missile-carrying American airplanes are standing by ready to take off at any moment.

All of this, it appears, is insufficient to the current U. S. administration. Trillions of dollars are being appropriated in order to increase even further the amount of armaments on land, sea and air and in outer space. The President also announced that broad steps will be taken to develop qualitatively new conventional weapons systems. This will open yet another channel in the arms race.

No one should be misled by insistent big talk of the "Soviet military threat," however frequently repeated. All that the Soviet Union has done and is doing does not indicate in the least its desire to gain military superiority. The treaties and agreements which we have concluded or are prepared to conclude with the American side are aimed at lowering the level of nuclear confrontation without disturbing the parity, i.e., without harming the security of the USSR and the United States.

It is unseemly for those who derailed the SALT II Agreement, which was aimed at precisely this objective, to try today to assume the posture of peace makers. While rejecting our proposal that the Soviet Union and NATO maintain in Europe an equal number of missiles and airplanes, or else that there be no nuclear weapons -- be they medium-range or tactical -- at all, they continue to talk of the desire of the USSR to gain superiority. The methods used by today's Washington rulers in defaming Soviet policy are inadmissible in relations among countries.

Question: President Reagan said that he had invented some kind of new defense concept. What does this mean in practical terms?

Answer: This is worth special consideration. After extensively discussing the "Soviet military threat" President Reagan said that it was time to take a new approach to the question of securing U. S. strategic interests. In this connection, he proclaimed the start of the development of a wide-scale highly effective anti-missile defense.

At a first glance uninformed people may consider this as being even desirable, for the President is speaking of defensive measures. This, however, would apply only at a first glance and to the uninformed. In fact, the development and improvement of strategic offensive U. S. forces will be continued in full swing and in a fully defined direction -- acquiring the potential for a first nuclear strike. Under such circumstances, the intention of acquiring the possibility of destroying with the help of an anti-missile defense system the respective strategic armaments of the other country, i.e., to deprive it of the possibility to retaliate, is aimed at disarming the Soviet Union in the face of the American nuclear threat. This must be clearly seen in order to assess the true meaning of this "new concept" accurately.

At the time when the USSR and the United States began their discussions on the problem of strategic armaments, they both acknowledged that the connection between strategic offensive and defensive armaments is unbreakable. It was no accident that in 1972 our countries concluded simultaneously a treaty on

limiting their anti-missile defense systems and an initial agreement on limiting strategic offensive weapons.

In other words, the two sides recognized and codified in said documents the fact that only mutual restraint in the area of anti-missile defense could lead to any kind of progress in limiting and reducing offensive weapons, i.e., that it could restrain and turn back the strategic arms race as a whole. The United States intends today to break this interconnection. The results of such a concept, if implemented, would mean actually opening the gates to an unrestrained race in all types of strategic weapons -- offensive as well as defensive. Such is the true meaning, the other side, so to say, of Washington's "defensive concept."

[Question] What general conclusion should be drawn from this speech by the U.S. President?

[Answer] I shall answer briefly and simply: Today's U. S. administration is continuing to advance in an extremely dangerous direction. No such light-heartedness should be displayed on problems of war and peace. All efforts to gain military superiority over the USSR are futile. The Soviet Union will never allow this and will never find itself disarmed in the face of any kind of threat. Let this be clearly realized in Washington. It is time for it to stop inventing ever new variants on how best to start a nuclear war in the hope of winning it. Such occupations are not simply irresponsible but insane.

Although in his speech the President dealt mainly with the Soviet Union, it also applied to the interests of all countries and peoples. One must be aware of the fact that the American leaders are currently trying to turn the European countries into nuclear hostages. Washington's actions are threatening to the entire world.

Today all efforts must be directed toward the single objective of preventing a nuclear catastrophe. We firmly call upon the United States to take this road.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## POWERFUL WEAPON OF SCIENTIFIC COGNITION AND REVOLUTIONARY ACTION

AU291415 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No. 5, Mar 83 pp 14-34

[Article by Acad. A. Yegorov, director of the Marx'sm-Leninism Institute at the CPSU Central Committee]

[Text! The 50-volume publication of Karl Marx's and Friedrich Engels' complete works, by the Marxism-Leninism Institute at the CPSU Central Committee, is completed. Thus, an important decision of our party's Central Committee—which has always devoted and continues to devote unremitting attention to collecting, publishing and promoting the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism--has been implemented.

Our party regards the Marxist-Leninist teaching as the theoretical foundation of its policy and it tirelessly develops this teaching in accordance with the requirements of social life. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of our party's Central Committee, emphasized: "The CPSU ascribes great significance to developing the theory of Marxism-Leninism as its creative essence itself requires. This is vital for solving our practical tasks." ("KOMMUNIST," 1983, No. 3, pp 21-22)

The new edition of K. Marx's and F. Engels' works is a fundamental contribution to the ideological work of the CPSU and the cause of communist construction. It bears evidence of great successes scored by social science in the USSR and at the same time represents a secure base for it to move forward. This is not surprising, because we are talking of a publication that is scientific and the most complete in the world of the works of the founders of Marxism. A total of 50 volumes (54 books) supplemented by four reference books (index, alphabetic name and other references) have been placed on the bookshelf.

All completed works by Marx and Engels, all drafts that in any way represent anything whole, and rough versions that are of scientific value, as well as their vast epistolary heritage, authentic records of all their speeches at the meetings, gatherings and conferences of the workers' organizations and their interviews for various press organs have been included in the publication. The reader will find here all the forms and genres of the extremely rich literary heritage of these great proletarian thinkers. Here are both their youthful experiments in poetry and drama and their monumental classical

works; their militant journalism and programmatic documents of the workers' movement; pamphlets and articles which are models of skillful use of the bourgeois press in the interests of the proletariat. Here too are very interesting letters to hundreds of figures of the workers movement and letters overflowing with love and tenderness to those who were dear to them--these are human documents of tremendous force.

The 50-volume collection of works by K. Marx and F. Engels creates a panorama of their ideological heritage taken in its totality and interconnection. Marxism appears before us in the living unity of all its component parts and in the process of elaborating a scientific world outlook in inextricable connection with the struggle of the workers class for democracy and socialism. For the first time it becomes possible to follow to the full extent the formation and development of the Marxist philosophy, political economy and scientific socialism and of the strategy and tactics of the proletariat's struggle for liberation.

The publication provides an opportunity to truthfully evaluate the worth of the extraordinary breadth and depth of Marx's and Engels' investigation of the most diverse spheres of human knowledge: of world history, the history of certain world regions, countries and peoples as well as of philology, aesthetics, military science, mathematics, natural sciences, the history of science and technology and the problems of ecology and morality, and of their application of the method of materialist dialectics to all spheres of science.

The completeness of the publication of the literary heritage of the founders of Marxism is supplemented by a detailed scientific, historical and political commentary. The introductions, notes and references sum up the enormous research work of a collective of scientists, supported by all the achievements of Marxist studies, and of social science as a whole. The system of references not only helps us to understand the conditions of the creation and the concrete content of the works of the founders of scientific communism, but it also helps reveal their general-historical and theoretical value, their place in the process of the constant development of Marxist theory and their topical nature under present conditions. We would like to point out especially that included in the publication for the first time are the detailed "Dates of the Life and Activity of Karl Marx and F. Engels" which are in fact a biographical chronicle with a scientific value of its own. The reference system uses not only Lenin's concrete evaluations of certain works by Marx and Engels but also demonstrates the further creative development of their ideas by V. I. Lenin under new historical circumstances. Thus, we are talking not simply of a guidebook to Marx's and Engels' texts, but of a certain contribution to elaborating the history of Marxism-Leninism.

To prepare the publication of the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism is a very complicated affair. This great research work is of multifaceted nature and requires high qualification and collective efforts on the part of specialists from different sciences, such as philosophers, economists, historians, philologists, archivists-archeographers and so forth. In particular, while the collection of K. Marx's and F. Engels' works was being prepared



for publication, the authorship of many articles and reports was ascertained which at the time were with either published anonymously or under a pen name. As a result of research, more than 200 previously unknown papers by Marx and Engels which had at the time been published in the radical democratic (RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG), in the Chartist newspapers and magazines, in the (NEUE RHEINISCHE ZEITUNG) which they had edited during the 1848-49 revolution, in the progressive bourgeois paper NEW YORK DAILY TRIBUNE, in the press organs of the First International and in other periodicals--all these were included in the present publication. The majority of these materials were brought to light by the scientists of the Marxism-Leninism Institute at the CPSU Central Committee. Many of these papers contain important theoretical principles and generalizations. They broaden significantly our ideas of the journalistic activity of the founders of Marxism during different periods of their life.

Of great value are also the newly discovered documents of proletarian organizations, either written by Marx and Engels directly or prepared with their active participation. One of these documents is, for example, the initial draft of the program of the Communist League, namely the "Draft of the Communist Symbol of Faith" composed by Engels in summer 1847.

The publication includes all the volumes of DAS KAPITAL as well as all its main preparatory manuscript versions and other economic manuscripts by Marx, draft articles on various subjects by the founders of Marxism, plans for their papers, notes from papers on world history and so on--in a word, many new documents shedding additional light on the life and activity of the great thinkers of the revolutionary proletariat.

Summing up the research work of more than one generation of Soviet scientists who in a planned manner implemented the tasks set by the party in the sphere of publishing the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, the 50-volume collection of works by K. Marx and F. Engels answers the objective requirements of our times.

It would be quite justified to say that the growing significance of Marxist-Leninist theory and the need to develop it further under modern conditions determine the necessity of mastering Marxism-Leninism thoroughly and comprehensively.

In his article "Karl Marx" written in 1914, V. I. Lenin begins the section entitled "Literature" by stating that a "complete collection of Marx's writings and letters has up to now not yet been published" (Complete Works, Vol. 26, p 28). This section concluded with the following statement by Lenin: "It is impossible to comprehend Marxism and give a complete account of it without taking into consideration all the works by Engels" (Ibid, p 93). In other words, to master Marxism genuinely it is necessary to know the literary heritage of its founders in its entirety. This position became an axiom for all Marxist-Leninists and the program of action for the Marxism-Leninism Institute at the CPSU Central Committee.

It is no secret that in the course of the contemporary ideological struggle our ideological opponents are trying to use the works of Marx and Engels by falsifying them. In the West the bourgeois publishing houses are now publishing a fair number of their works, usually in an abridged version and with biased commentaries. The aim of this "selection" of the works of the classics of Marxism is clear: to belittle their universal-historical and international significance, impoverish them and make vapid their socioclass content. The bourgeois ideologists and politicians are very well aware of the fact that to become acquainted with the works of Marx and Engels in their entirety means to undermine in every relatively unprejudiced person his faith in the main dogmas of bourgeois propaganda, namely in the myths of the "obsolescence" of Marxism, its allegedly stagnant and dogmatic nature and so forth.

That is why the theoretical and political significance of the 50-volume publication of K. Marx's and F. Engels' collected works is truly enormous. This publication makes it possible to understand the laws of the emergence and development of the scientific world outlook of the proletariat and the laws of implementing it in the course of the struggle of the revolutionary workers class and the broad masses of the working people under the leadership of the Marxist party, for democracy and socialism. Not only does it fully confirm Lenin's entirely profound definition of Marxism as a teaching which gives answers to the basic questions raised by the entire development of human history, but it also makes it possible for the first time to see by concrete examples and in great detail how, on what basis and by what method the answers to these topical questions were formed. Studying the publication helps one to comprehend that behind every Marxist principle and conclusion and behind every phrase seemingly dropped in passing and every thought expressed there is a wealth of deeply grasped facts and these are the results gained by science in the process of studying actual reality and social relations.

The collected works of K. Marx and F. Engels show that the genesis and the entire subsequent development of Marxism is one entity. At the same time the inherent logic of theory and social life dictated the necessity, under concrete conditions, to move forward, to the foreground, certain aspects of Marxism, a fact which also corresponded to the necessities of the historical development of the proletarian movement. This was at one time emphasized by Lenin. The publication convincingly proves that at every stage of its development Marxism is a system consolidated in itself rather than a sum of separate principles adapted, so to speak, to the requirements of the current moment.

The works of Marx and Engels, in particular their letters and preparatory materials which allow us to penetrate their creative laboratory, bear evidence that from the moment it appeared Marxism developed and continues to develop on the basis of its own firm principles reflecting the basic laws of the objective world, and of the latter's cognition and revolutionary transformation. It is precisely the elaboration of these principles which laid the foundations for its constant development and enrichment.



Revealing the great meaning and sociopolitical significance of Marxism, Lenin demonstrated in his work "Karl Marx" that Marxism is a complete and consistent revolutionary doctrine and a militant dialectical-materialistic world outlook. He demonstrated that Marx and Engels, having adopted and critically processed all the achievements of the advanced philosophy and world culture and having scientifically generalized the experience of the revolutionary struggle of the workers class and the broad masses of the working people in different countries, accomplished the greatest turn in the history of public awareness and in the history of the social liberation of the working people.

Firstly, only the scientific materialism of Marx and Engels revealed the social essence of the individual and the production relations to be the economic foundation of society. Marxism further enriched materialism with dialectics, that is, with the most complete and comprehensive doctrine about the development of the objective world and the cognition which reflects it. Thus, reality was theoretically analyzed from the viewpoint of its economic and social relations taken in their onward movement and in the process of their contradictory development; the individual was seen in his relations with the surrounding world and in his activity which transforms reality. Thus, critically adopting and processing the achievements of German classical philosophy and, first and foremost, Hegel's dialectics, Marx and Engels created materialistic dialectics which overcame the limitations of the former materialism and which was radically different from Hegel's dialectics based on idealism.

Secondly, having enriched the labor theory of value as formulated by A. Smith, D. Riccardo and other representatives of the classical bourgeois political economy, the founders of Marxism expanded materialistic dialectics to encompass public life including material production and people's material productive activity. Thus, Marxist political economy was shaped, which revealed the economic laws of the capitalist society and the historical necessity of overthrowing private ownership and substituting for it public ownership.

It is important to emphasize that Marx and Engels combined the elaboration of political-economic problems with a philosophical analysis of reality which was carried out from the point of view of studying the objective contradictions leading to the liquidation of capitalism. Thus, the philosophical materialism of Marx and Engels directed the workers class to the road of intellectual liberation whereas their economic theory, whose cornerstone is the added value theory, revealed the real position of the workers class in the general system of capitalism.

Thirdly, explaining the real relations between the people, their activity and the objective conditions, the founders of Marxism provided a scientific understanding of the class struggle. This was a qualitatively new stage in the development of social thought compared to that which was accomplished by the French historians Guizot, Thierry and Mignet. Marx and Engels

demonstrated the decisive role of the workers class in overthrowing capitalism and in creating and establishing socialist production relations.

Fourthly, substantiating the materialistic understanding of history and applying it to the cognition of the bourgeois society which existed at the time, Marx and Engels revealed the objective law of transition from capitalism to socialism, while regarding this transition as a united dialectical process and as the movement of mankind to a new and higher stage of social progress. Their doctrine transformed the humanitarian ideals of the best minds of the former generations from being benign desires and dreams into a harmonious science of the struggle to liberate the working people from the yoke of exploitation and for the communist transformation of society. By doing this they armed the workers movement with a theory and program of revolutionary-transforming activity based on a solid scientific foundation and created scientific socialism.

The publication offers the opportunity to profoundly understand how Marx and Engels, striving to merge philosophy with life and theory with practice, saw in the proletariat the only class whose interests completely coincided with the requirements of social progress, a class vitally interested in genuinely scientific cognition and the revolutionary transformation of the world. Lenin considered this "clarification of the world-wide historical role of the proletariat as the creator of the socialist society" to be the most important principle of Marxism (See: Complete Works, Vol. 23, p 1).

From its first steps the strictly scientific nature of Marxism was inseparably connected with the vital interests of the workers class and all the working people. The founders of Marxism derived their strength and inspiration not from the quietness of their study but from the revolutionary storms and the struggle for the happiness of the working people. Their entire life is an unfading feat of courage in the name of the good of mankind. That is why all the attempts on the part of bourgeois ideologists to oppose Marx and Engels as scientists to Marx and Engels as the ideologists of the proletariat are not based on realistic foundations. This is a blatant falsification of facts and of the real history of Marxism.

The material related to the process of merging Marxism with the mass workers' movement is vast, truly inexhaustible and far from being thoroughly investigated by the scientists: philosophers, economists and historians. This process is a deeply law-governed phenomenon, precisely because Marxism expresses the vital interests of the proletariat and also because the workers' movement is generated by the objective tendencies of the capitalist society, which for the first time in history provides the oppressed class with the opportunity of "self-realization and the creation of this very world wide workers' movement...and those very socialist parties which consciously lead the struggle of the masses" (Complete Works, Vol. 39, p 82).

However, the objective law-governed nature of this process is by no means identical with its spontaneous character. This is hardly one volume in the publication which does not bear evidence of the tireless and purposeful

struggle of Marx and Engels and their companions-in-arms to unite Marxist theory with the proletarian movement. The formation of the proletarian party was a result and, at the same time, a powerful weapon of this process.

At the dawn of the proletarian movement it was particularly important to determine which way the parties of the workers class were going to choose: whether they were going to become an appendix of the bourgeoisie or acquire political independence and firmly stand on the proletarian class positions of struggle against the bourgeoisie and against all forms of social and national oppression, whether they would turn into sectarian groups of conspirators alienated from the people or become militant revolutionary parties, whether they would be amorphous associations or, on the contrary, disciplined and purposeful organizations.

Attentively studying the laws of social development and the tendencies of capitalism, Marx and Engels, inseparably united scientific socialism with the political struggle of the workers class. Going beyond general sociological principles they carried their social analysis to the point of stating the concrete political conclusions and tasks facing the proletariat. They revealed the goals and the ideothoretical and organizational principles of the activity of the workers class party, the foundations of its revolutionary strategy and tactic and its relations with the other detachments of the workers' movement, as well as the methods and forms of struggle and the ways of strengthening the party's ties with the broad masses of the working people. What is more, Marx and Engels did not only translate the theoretical principles of scientific socialism into the language of practical actions of the workers class party but also implemented these principles. They were at the cradle of the League of Communists and played a decisive role in the formation and activity of the International Fellowship of Workers--the First International which ideologically prepared the Paris commune and paved the way for the formation and consolidation of the workers class parties in various countries. All this showed that Marxism became these parties' ideopolitical foundation and their banner and that the workers class became an independent political force. Engels wrote in 1889: "In order for the proletariat to prove itself to be strong enough in the decisive moment and capable of winning, it is necessary--Marx and I have defended this position since 1847--that it should form a special party separate from all others, opposing them and recognizing itself as a class party" (K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol. 37, p 275).\*

The development of a Marxist world outlook went hand in hand with the formation of the political parties of the workers class which expressed the vital interests of the working people. The present publication offers an opportunity to trace this process in detail.

---

\*From now on references to the collected works of Marx and Engels will only state the volume and page.



Analyzing the prospects of the revolutionary process under capitalist conditions, the founders of Marxism discovered that the liquidation of the system of exploitation and the building of a new society are only possible as a result of the conscious activity of the workers class which rallies the broad strata of the working people around itself. This fundamental principle substantiated and continues to substantiate the objective necessity of forming a Marxist party of the workers class. At the same time Marx and Engels proved that the workers class needs such a party not only during the period of struggle to overthrow the power of the capital but also during the period of building a new society. The resolution of the London conference of the First International adopted in 1871 states that "organizing the workers class in a political party is necessary to secure the victory of the social revolution and achieve its final goal--the elimination of classes..." (Vol. 17, p 427).

Marx and Engels explained the vanguard nature of the workers class party which represents the highest form of its organization, is armed with an advanced theory and clearly comprehends the dialectics of the final goal and the ways leading to it. Thus, the 50-volume edition of their works provides an opportunity to retrace attentively the way by which the founders of Marxism elaborated and practically tested, affirmed and implemented the principles of the organizational structure and activity of the proletarian party.

Revealing the worldwide historical role of the proletariat, Marx and Engels also scientifically proved the objective necessity of the international cohesion of the workers' movement in the name of achieving its short-term and ultimate goals. Marx and Engels regarded internationalism as an inalienable feature of the proletarian party and mercilessly stigmatized even the tiniest deviations from it. Apart from this, according to their conviction, the internationalism of a proletarian party cannot be confined simply to general appeals for cohesion. They demanded its concrete and consistent implementation in the programs and practical activity of the workers parties. It was precisely from these positions that Marx criticized the draft of the Gotha program of the German Social-Democratic Party. It is precisely upon this that Marx and Engels insist in their numerous letters to figures of the workers movement appealing to them to demonstrate their internationalism in action.

This genuine internationalism--internationalism in action--has proved its great significance as a very important intellectual and material force of social development in the course of the entire history of the workers movement. This was the case in the days of the Paris commune and during all three Russian revolutions as well as in the years of the Civil War and the foreign intervention in Russia. This was also the case during the period of revolutionary wars in China and during the time of the heroic struggle of the Spanish people against fascism in the thirties and during the years of World War II. This was also the case during the times of the "cold war" and in the course of supporting the just cause of the Vietnamese people and the Cuban revolution. This continues to be the case now.



Of course, there are theoreticians--and the ranks of the workers' movement are not free of them--who claim that under contemporary conditions the "national elements" are growing and deepening at the expense of the internationalist ones. However, this conclusion is based at the very least on an antidialectical view of the problem. These theoreticians see only one side of it--the growing variety of social life and the workers' movement--and they fail to see that this variety itself unfolds on the basis of the--every more clearly delineated--common and united tendencies, and that it is only a form in which these manifest themselves and that the common international interests of the workers' movement are constantly revealed and enhanced by the objective course of the onward movement of society.

Proletarian internationalism does not at all mean that the national interests of the workers' class are in any way underestimated. On the contrary, Engels wrote that "in the workers' movement the genuinely national ideas... are at the same time always the genuinely international ideas" (Vol. 33, p 374). The founders of Marxism emphasized that the communists must deeply realize their responsibility both to the workers' class and the people of their country and to the international workers' class. They must never lose sight of the "principle of the internationalist nature of the workers' movement" (Vol. 19, p 2).

The greatest achievement of Marx and Engels lies in the fact that they consistently and in a scientific manner solved the cardinal question of the dialectics of that which is international and that which is national in the workers' movement and in the activity of the proletarian party. It also lies in the fact that they proved the necessity for the International Workers' Movement of Unity on the national and international scale, which unity takes on different forms depending on the concrete historical conditions but which nevertheless constantly continues to be the "international brotherhood of the workers' classes of different countries in their joint struggle against the ruling classes" (Ibid, p 22).

Firstly, Marx and Engels were of the opinion that the basic foundations of the policy, strategy and tactics of the revolutionary workers' movement--proceeding from the acceptance of the general laws of development of the revolution and socialist construction--are inseparably linked with proletarian internationalism. That is why the communists, in keeping with the Marxist doctrine, are characterized by their deep understanding of the objective laws, are guided by them and combine their knowledge with the consideration given to the specific conditions and traditions in each individual country. They do not allow specific national features to be exaggerated, nor do they allow them to be disregarded. With every step they take into account the world situation as a whole and are aware of their responsibility to the world liberation movement.

Secondly, while defending the fraternal unity of all nations and races, the founders of Marxism rejected every instance of one people (or group of peoples) being pitted against other peoples (or groups). To Marx belongs the following famous statement: "The people who enslave other people are

forging their own chains" (Vol. 16, p 407). Uttered in connection with his analysis of English-Irish relations it is of basic and general significance. The new edition contains materials stigmatizing the policy of the English colonizers in India, of the French in Algiers and others. And everywhere Marx and Engels take their stand as active and consistent fighters against the colonial system and as passionate exposers of the ideology of colonialism.

Thirdly, the founders of Marxism showed that the principled and uncompromising struggle against all forms of influence of the bourgeois ideology on the workers' movement is the law of life of the proletarian parties. The collected works of Marx and Engels represent in an accumulated form their 50 years of experience of struggle against all types and forms of bourgeois "reformatory trends," [reformatorstva] anarchism and reformism and against the various manifestations of anticommunism and all concessions in ideological questions.

During the preparation of the new publication particular care was given to bringing out materials that attest to the growing influence of Marxism on the entire course of the public life and the social progress of mankind. The content of these volumes convincingly demonstrates that the growth of the ideological and organizational maturity of the workers' movement and its combat efficiency is connected, first of all, with adopting the ideas of scientific communism. In its turn, as the mass workers' movement was united with Marxism, it became, to an ever increasing degree, a powerful force of social development.

Even in the lifetime of Marx and Engels, Marxism--the very high achievement of science and entire culture--became a constantly active factor of development of progressive social thought. This was reflected in the constantly growing number of Marxists both in the workers' movement itself and among the advanced intelligentsia. These were, however, only the first steps of the triumphal march of Marxist thought; its flourishing is connected with the Leninist stage of the development of Marxism and with the implementation of Lenin's great ideas in the practice of building socialism and communism.

Even in the times of Marx and Engels the appearance of anti-Marxism as an indispensable element of the bourgeois ideology became a kind of indicator of Marxism's growing impact on social life: it was no longer possible to pretend that Marxism did not exist. Life broke down the "conspiracy of silence" which the bourgeoisie attempted to create around the Marxist doctrine which was gaining strength.

If we try to summarize in the most condensed form the very rich content of the works of Marx and Engels, it is necessary to state quite definitely that this is a truly inexhaustible treasury of theoretical thought and a very rich chronicle of the history of the workers' movement. The publication is a gigantic memorial to Marxist thought and action. It bears the indelible imprint of the personalities of its founders and makes it possible to recreate in full measure the images of the leaders of the proletariat in all their glory and humanitarianism.

Studying the new edition of the works of K. Marx and F. Engels, everyone can see for himself what a very accurate and inexhaustible source of reproducing the picture of their life and activity it is. It can be said, to use Goethe's expression, that here "poetry and truth" are inseparable. Conversely, when our ideological adversaries try to use the images of Marx and Engels in their own, that is anti-communist, spirit, they address themselves for this purpose to various turbid sources, be it the writings of the enemies of Marx and Engels, dubious political documents or clearly slanderous attacks against them by notorious reactionaries, using neo-Freudian vivisection of their letters distorted to the point of unrecognizability.

The experience of the history of the proletariat's struggle for liberation and the history of Marxism-Leninism shows that from the moment of its appearance Marxist theory has been constantly subjected to attacks by its class enemies; they either attempted to reject or distort it, "combining" it with all sorts of nonproletarian concepts. Even Marx and Engels had to fight the attempts to "supplement" Marxism with petty-bourgeois "additions" allegedly in order to make it acceptable to the broad masses but in fact for the benefit of the carriers of petty-bourgeois ideology in the ranks of the workers' movement. Speaking against such tendencies, the founders of Marxism not only exposed their class essence but also elaborated the methodological foundations of the struggle against all forms of distorting the scientific world outlook of the revolutionary proletariat. The study of their works, taken as a whole, makes it possible to single out certain main aspects of their methodological approach to this question.

First of all, all attempts to revise Marxism constitute a substitution of the genuine study of society by pseudo-scientific cliches. Whereas Marx and Engels transformed socialism from utopia into science, their adversaries are now trying to transform scientific socialism into utopia. Let us recall in this connection that even the founders of Marxism emphasized that once socialism became a science it should be treated as a science, which means that it should be studied.

Besides, just like every true science, Marxism is based on immovable laws which it discovered and whose veracity has been confirmed by the entire course of history. Marx and Engels mercilessly rebuffed all distortions of these laws. K. Marx wrote: "We are not striving to anticipate the future in a dogmatic way, rather we want to...discover the new world by way of criticizing the old one" (Vol. 1, p 379). They decisively spoke against those theoreticians who "invent various systems and strive to discover some reviving science" (Vol. 4, p 146) and substitute the objective analysis of the objective social relations with speculative constructions. At the same time--and this is where the dialectical character of the Marxist theory manifests itself--Marxism is not a dogma. It is constantly developing. The creative nature of Marxism is its essence.

Marx and Engels tirelessly and persistently demanded of their companions-in-arms and of the socialist parties that, while deeply comprehending reality and its tendencies, they adopt a creative attitude toward theory



and become capable of applying Marxism under concrete conditions and of summing up the new phenomena of life. To use Lenin's words, Marx and Engels stigmatized the "helplessness in developing theoretical thought" (Complete Works, Vol. 6, p 23). They proceeded from the principle that creative development must not signify a step away from scientific theory but rather a step forward in the sphere of science and that it must be implemented on the basis of the fundamental principles of scientific communism, not by bypassing these principles. Also, of course, creative development must be implemented in insoluble connection with practice and historical experience.

At the beginning of the 20th century when mankind entered a new historical stage which raised in a new way many social questions, the cause of the founders of Marxism was taken over by Lenin. Lenin not only successfully defended the purity of Marxism in the struggle against its opponents but also creatively developed all its component parts. Lenin comprehensively investigated the economic and political essence of imperialism and the ideological phenomena which it generates. He substantiated the objective possibility of the victory of socialism first in several or even one individual country. He uncovered the motive forces of the socialist revolution, revealed the internal unity of all the currents of the anti-imperialist struggle, comprehensively elaborated the doctrine of the party role under new conditions and armed the workers' class and the communist parties with scientific strategy and tactics regardless of where they act. In one word, Lenin contributed so much of what is new and great to the doctrine of the founders of scientific communism that Marxism became Marxism-Leninism.

At the beginning of the 20th century our Leninist party whose 80th anniversary we are celebrating this year also came out on the proscenium of history. It bravely led the working masses headed by the workers' class to storm tsarism and capitalism while implementing Leninism which is the Marxism of the contemporary stage.

Lenin said: "We base ourselves entirely on Marx's theory..." At the same time he emphasized that "we are far from regarding Marx's theory as something complete and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it only laid the cornerstone of the science which the socialists must expand in all directions if they do not wish to lag behind life" (Complete Works, Vol. 4, pp 182, 184).

The 50-volume edition of the works of Marx and Engels is a genuine encyclopedia of Marxism--a theory which was developed and raised to new heights by Lenin, the great successor of Marx's and Engels' cause, a theory which has nowadays won millions of minds and hearts and has been implemented in the construction of the new society to whose grandiose achievements we are all witnesses. Communists will constantly consult this treasury of knowledge and methodological wealth because only by consulting Marx, Engels and Lenin and on the basis of the great principles of the Marxist-Leninist theory, tested and confirmed by historical experience, is it possible to find the correct answers to the new questions with which the course of social



development confronts mankind. It is known that our time is characterized by its extraordinary complexity. It is rich in contradictions and new revolutionary opportunities. Under the present conditions everything requires a well-founded scientific analysis, be it the deep social changes taking place in the world, the widening scope of the scientific-technical revolution which encompasses all the spheres of public life, the general crisis of capitalism, the threat of nuclear war coming from imperialism and, finally, the irreversible onward movement of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which is, however, not free of difficulties. This scientific analysis, revealing the realistic possibilities and ways of the historical activity of the masses and their struggle for peace and social progress, can be successfully accomplished only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and in the unity of its theory and method.

Every publication of newly discovered works by Marx and Engels enlarges the ideothoretical arsenal of the CPSU and the fraternal parties who widely use it in solving the present-day economic, sociopolitical and ideological problems. In this context the second edition of Marx's and Engels' works is of particular importance.

If we consider the Marxist economic teaching, then all the main manuscript versions of *DAS KAPITAL* included in the publication add up to a very great theoretical wealth. Taken as a whole not only do they provide the opportunity to study the process of creation of Marx's immortal work but they also contain some essential principles and conclusions which were not included in the basic version of *DAS KAPITAL* or in other papers.

Let us consider just one example. The French edition of the first volume of *DAS KAPITAL*, long passages from which are published in the second edition of K. Marx's and F. Engels' works, contains a principle which is very important for understanding the processes of the evolution of modern capital, the principle of the inevitable future deformation of the cycles of capitalist reproduction and of the increasingly frequent crisis slumps in the bourgeois economy.

Conclusions of this type must be attentively studied and applied in ideothoretical work. However, the most important thing is not so much these separate principles, great though their significance is, the most important thing is the basic methodological principle discovered by Lenin. Lenin convincingly demonstrated that imperialism grows out of the "old" capitalism and therefore this new stage, with its own specific laws, does not cancel the fundamental laws of the capitalist formation or its essential ties and relations but rather modifies them. This is why Lenin's classical work *IMPERIALISM AS THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM* is essentially a continuation of Marx's *DAS KAPITAL* under new historical conditions and is inwardly connected with it. Therefore, to delve into the profound meaning of Marx's examination--for the first time published in such a full form--of the laws of development of pre-monopolist capitalism will also help one to grasp better the classical Leninist analysis of the monopolistic stage of capitalism without which it is impossible to understand the processes taking place inside

modern capitalism, because monopolies result from the increased concentration of production and its socialization and are the highest form of capitalism's basic contradiction: that between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation.

Of course, at present, under the conditions of state-monopolistic capitalism, new processes take place as well, processes which not only did not exist during the lifetime of Marx and Engels—who were greatly interested (particularly Engels in the last years of his life) in the formation and role of share-holding associations—but which were absent even during the lifetime of Lenin who was the first to expose the nature of imperialism and state-monopolist capitalism. However, in spite of all this, the essence of imperialism remains unchanged and therefore its basic characteristic features and contradictions continue to hold and the laws discovered by Lenin remain in force, although the forms in which these laws and contradictions manifest themselves do not and cannot continue to be the same. Depending on concrete historical circumstances they change and new forms of the revolutionary struggle of the workers' class and all the working people come to life accordingly.

These new forms in which the laws of capitalism manifest themselves as well as the new forms of the anti-imperialist struggle of the revolutionary forces require thorough investigation which will yield lessons and conclusions necessary for practical activity. This investigation can be fruitful and well-grounded only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism taken in its entirety and the unity of all its component parts and by analysing the new phenomena which arise in the world of capital under the influence of new social factors. These are, first of all, the growing power and influence of world socialism on the social development due to the present correlation of socioclass forces in the world arena and the expanding scientific-technical revolution.

It is precisely this truly Marxist comprehensive, concrete and objectively accurate analysis of the social processes in their dialectical development which eliminates dogmatism and subjectivism and helps obtain a considerable accumulation of scientific knowledge.

Let us take a cardinal problem such as the scientific-technical revolution. It is no secret that just recently, when the subject of science was brought up in our country, the discussion was confined to analyzing it as one of the forms of public awareness. Taking this approach to science in the absolute, which is quite legitimate but one-sided, led to a situation where clearly too little attention was devoted to the study of science as a form and type of intellectual activity and to the dialectics of its transformation into an immediate production force under capitalist and socialist conditions as well as to the role of science in the system of social production. However, even in his economic manuscript of 1857-58 Marx pointed out this tendency of transforming science into an immediate productive force of society. Later, in his economic manuscript of 1861-63 he made this concept more concrete emphasizing that "capitalist production for the first time transforms the material process of production into a form of applying

science to production--into applied science..." (Vol. 47, p 559). At the same time Marx revealed the inwardly contradictory and antagonistic nature of the development of science under capitalist conditions when applying science in production happens "only by way of subordinating the worker to the capital and by way of suppressing the intellectual and professional development of the worker himself" (Ibid). What is more, Marx brilliantly foresaw that the role of science will be immeasurably enhanced in the future socialist and communist society where the "exploitation of scientific progress by capital" and all the social obstacles preventing the effective application of science in production will be eliminated.

Marx spoke of this at the time when, in his own words, the extent to which science had encompassed the entire production was relatively limited. All the more remarkable is therefore the force of his scientific foresight which enabled him even at that time to bring to light the objective tendencies of the scientific progress which determine the main way of development of science, technical equipment and technology. Marx wrote, for example, that the highest form of the instruments of labor are automated systems of machinery. He wrote that the creation of such a system substantially changes the place of the individual in production. Consequently, Marx has pointed out the phenomena which have fully developed at the present stage of the scientific-technical revolution. At the same time it is impossible to understand the antagonistic nature of the scientific-technical revolution under the conditions of state-monopolistic capitalism, let alone its social consequences under socialism, without taking into account all that was done in this field by Lenin. Suffice it to recall the methodological significance of Lenin's conclusions about the essence of the latest revolution in natural sciences at the beginning of the 20th century and about the inseparable connection between the scientific technical revolution and the social problems of the contemporary era; about the deepening contradiction between labor and capital during the process of expanding scientific-technical revolution and within its framework; about the fact that the technology of capitalism outgrows more and more with each passing day its social conditions which condemn the working people to hired slavery; about the transformation of science under socialism into a powerful personality-forming source and an active factor in the planned development of society in the interests of the people and social progress; about the alliance of science with workers and all the working people under socialism.

These ideas of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, taken in their unity and entirety and creatively applied to contemporary life, make it possible to recognize life's leading tendencies and thereupon find the correct answers to the questions which life raises for communists and all the people who are fighting for the victory of the new system and creating it.

If we are talking of the scientific-technical revolution, then it is also necessary from the point of view of Marxism-Leninism to see its complex and dialectically contradictory nature in our own reality. Of course these contradictions are of a nonantagonistic nature but even they require constant attention and a search for the most rational forms of their solution,



be its contradictions appearing in the process of the socialization and division of labor or in the process of interaction between the scientific-technical revolution and the intellectual forming of the individual, between technology in its development and the preservation of the surrounding ecology. Only a purposeful analysis based on the methodological principles of materialistic dialectics can make it possible to reveal the basic tendencies of these processes and the ways of solving the scientific-technical and social tasks in stages and in a mutually connected and comprehensive fashion.

If we are talking of the problems of social revolution, then the wealth of ideas and methodological decisions contained in the works of K. Marx and F. Engels represents an inexhaustible source of inspiration both for the theoretical comprehension of the problems of the contemporary world revolutionary process and for the practical activity of Marxist-Leninist parties. Of basic importance are the very points of departure of the founders of Marxism. They taught us that the socialist revolution is not only necessary because there is no other way to overthrow the ruling exploiter classes but also because only in the course of the revolution can the proletariat itself "shed all the old abominations and become capable of creating the new foundation of society" (Vol. 3, p 70). In the 50 volumes of K. Marx's and F. Engels' collected works the reader can become acquainted with all their conclusions and thoughts about the hegemonic role of the workers' class in the revolution, about its allies, the interaction of the proletariat and national-liberation movements and the dialectical correlation of the peaceful (unarmed) and not peaceful (armed) forms of struggle of the workers' class.

Marx wrote that the historical development can continue to be "peaceful" only as long as the exploiters "do not start to hinder this development by way of violence" (Vol. 45, p 142). Marx and Engels pointed out that in this case decisive measures must be taken. This in no way contradicts the principle of humanitarianism but, on the contrary, agrees with it, because otherwise the reactionaries would drown the revolution in a sea of blood. The analysis of the counterrevolution, to which the founders of Marxism referred as the "blood-thirsty agony of the old society" and which is contained in their works, is of great significance for solving the contemporary problems of struggle against the reactionary forces. This is an important aspect of the heritage of the great leaders of the proletariat which has not yet been sufficiently well studied and treated in scientific literature.

The greatest service rendered by the founders of Marxism to progressive mankind is undoubtedly the fact that while elaborating the theoretical problems of the workers' class and all the working people they put forward the idea of the world revolutionary process on the basis of the history of the liberation movements in all countries.

Of particular interest in this respect are the observations of Marx and Engels about the revolutionary movement in Russia. Between the fifties and the eighties as well as later they thoroughly investigated the various possibilities and prospects of the revolution in our country. Let us recall that in 1894 Engels wrote about the ever accelerating rate at which Russia



was being transformed into a capitalist-industrial country, about the proletarianization of a substantial number of peasants and about the destruction of the community (See: Vol. 22, p 452). It is important to emphasize that while speaking of the revolutionary-democratic movement of the peoples' masses in Russia, Marx and Engels did not view it in isolation but rather in its inseparable connection with the workers' movement in the West and deeply revealed the inward unity of the revolutionary-democratic movements of the working people and the struggle of the international revolutionary proletariat. At the same time, while revealing the essence of the world revolutionary process, they voiced brilliant arguments about the possibility of noncapitalist development under certain conditions and on the powerful influence exerted by the example of those countries, where the socialist revolution will win and on the peoples that are backward in the socioeconomic respect. It is also important to emphasize that the founders of Marxism-Leninism clearly saw the objective causes and factors which brought Russia onto the road of the proletarian revolution.

As Lenin justly remarked, Marx and Engels has optimistic faith in the Russian revolution and in its powerful worldwide impact. Indeed, while elaborating, together with Marx, the ideas of creating the future "Russian Commune" (Vol. 19, p 252), Engels prophesized that the approaching Russian revolution would overthrow the autocracy and bind the forces of the European reaction hand and foot and that the "revolutionary initiative of a new social transformation" (Vol. 21, p 490) will belong to Russia.

When at the end of the 19th-beginning of the 20th century the center of the world revolutionary process moved to Russia, these ideas of Marx and Engels assumed particular significance.

Lenin wrote: "Above all Marx values the historical initiative of the masses" (Complete Works, Vol 14, p 377). He came to this conclusion on the basis of Marx's evaluation of the experience of Paris communards who had lit up the first small light of the new proletarian power. Although the Paris Commune did not last long, its heroic example could not be suppressed. The October Revolution unfolded the very broad initiative of the peoples' masses, whereas the Bolshevik party, while leading the masses, skillfully directed their various actions along the path of one single organizational and conscious historical activity which, owing to the presence of the objective conditions, became the decisive factor of victory. In this connection the Leninist party relied on the entire worldwide revolutionary experience of the workers' class, including the experience of the 1848 and 1871 revolutions.

Lenin said that we stand on the shoulders of the Paris Commune which, for the first time in history, demonstrated the necessity of destroying the oppression apparatus of the bourgeois state and creating a new proletarian state. However, the experience of the Paris communards, just like the revolutionary experience of the other peoples, was creatively assimilated in the course of the three Russian revolutions and enriched with the historic deeds of the peoples' masses of Russia headed by the Bolshevik party. A new form of the power of the working people in the state--Soviets of workers', peasants' and soldiers' deputies--emerged in our country.

After 1871--and this was brilliantly demonstrated by the three Russian revolutions--the international workers' class took a giant step along the path of implementing the Marxist ideas. The great October vividly revealed the common aims and the common laws of the socialist revolution which were manifested--in their original way but as a result of objective necessity--in all the subsequent socialist revolutions. It initiated a new stage in the history of mankind--the stage of transition from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale, the era of communist civilization.

While exposing the exploiter essence of capitalism, Marx and Engels proceeded from the idea that it must inevitably give way to a new social system, namely socialism. They firmly believed in the victory of the communist civilization. This conviction of theirs was based strictly on science. Lenin wrote: "There is not a bit of utopia in Marx in the sense that he may have invented and in his fantasy created a 'new' society" (Complete Works, Vol. 33, p 48). On the contrary, having transformed socialism from utopia into science, the founders of Marxism strove also to approach the analysis of the future problems as materialists and dialecticians. They studied the birth of the new society from the old one as something which develops out of capitalism. They strove first of all to bring to light and explain the material conditions of liberating the proletariat and building the new society. They thoroughly examined the process of "creating" within the framework of capitalism itself the "material conditions for its destruction and...abolishing its historical justification as a necessary form of economic development and production of public wealth" (Vol. 49, p 119). They investigated the creation of prerequisites for the "unlimited...production forces of public labor which alone can form the material base of a free human society" (Ibid, p 47).

These observations are taken from Marx's economic manuscript of 1863-1864 which has not reached us in its complete form and is known as "Chapter Six. The Results of the Immediate Production Process." However, it is not only in their economic works, including *DAS KAPITAL* but also in many other papers that Marx and Engels touched upon the problems of the new society which comes to replace capitalism. In this respect it is impossible, for example, to overestimate the significance of their "Communist Party Manifesto"--the militant program of the international proletariat--or Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Program." They attentively studied the experience of the mass proletarian movement, drew political conclusions from it and determined the realistic paths which lead to the establishment of a working people's regime.

It is natural that, due to the conditions of their time, the founders of Marxism could only draw the general outline of the future. Besides, they did not pursue the task of throwing light on the "details" of the new society. They strove to define the initial features of its emergence and "find the general tendency of the future development" (Vol. 37, p 371). And in this they succeeded extremely well.

Discussing the future society in its dynamics, Marx and Engels emphasized that socialism is inconceivable without the public ownership of the means of production and their "national centralization." However, the abolition of private ownership is not a single-act explosion but a process. They clearly foresaw the difficulties of forming collectivist social relations, corresponding ideas and views and the entire new psychological structure of the personality.

Historical experience incontestably confirmed the main laws of the unified process of establishing and developing the communist socioeconomic formation which was brilliantly defined by Marx and Engels. The founders of Marxism taught us that the road from capitalism to socialism and to a society without classes must pass through the revolutionary destruction of the old system and that it presupposes a transitional period of transformation of the former into the latter. A "political transitional period also corresponds" to this period "and the state emerging in this period can be nothing other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat" (Vol. 19, p 27).

Summarizing the experience of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels revealed the democratic nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a regime of the working people under the leadership of the workers' class in which the working people themselves manage "in their own interests their own public life" (Vol. 17, p 546). Lenin specially emphasized that the strength of the socialist state lies in the consciousness of the masses and this has nothing in common with "unrestricted tyranny" as the enemies of the workers' class try to depict it. We are talking of the measures designed to guarantee the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the victory of socialism which is built by the most democratic methods. He wrote: "Violence is strong with regard to those who want to resurrect their authority. However, the significance of violence is only reduced to this, from here onward strength lies in influence and example" (Complete Works, Vol. 42, p 75). Lenin demonstrated that as a result of the socialist revolution a basically new--as regards its class content--type of state is established and that it guarantees a maximum of democracy for the working people and their most active participation in all the spheres of public life and in the solution of those grandiose social tasks which are the essence and the main inspiration of the socialist revolution (See: Complete Works, Vol. 44, p 147).

This means that the Marxist-Leninist methodology also requires a historical approach to the doctrine of the state; understanding of the commonness of class nature, the main functions, goals and stages of the state with the proletarian dictatorship in spite of all its distinctive forms and the study of its gradual transformation into an all-people state as the new society progresses; and understanding, in line with Lenin's instructions, of the specific features regarding the content and forms of self-government at the various stages of the socialist and communist development, as applied both to the first years of the Soviet regime, the subsequent stages and to the period of full communism, bearing in mind the development of the genuine people's authority [narodovlastiye] and taking into account that socialist self-government is impossible without the state and the law. The social



experience demonstrates that it is precisely by consolidating the government and law-based superstructure, on the basis of the comprehensive expansion of socialist democracy and as a result of transforming currently existing political ties that our society will arrive at communist public self-rule which was mentioned by Marx and Engels.

Of great theoretical and practical significance is the fact that for the first time in history Marx clearly defined the main stages of the socioeconomic maturing of the communist formation. Together with Engels he foresaw that as the production forces develop the social structure of the new society and the entire way of life of the people is also perfected. He wrote about reaching a high level of production as a material prerequisite of a "differently established social process of life" (Vol. 49, p 119). Raising the general questions of the future society, Marx and Engels also often tackled the concrete analysis of the conditions under which it will function. Thus, in his paper "Critique of the Gotha Program" Marx not only explained the dialectics of production and consumption which is determined by production but, while criticizing the theory of "the uncurtailed labor return," he accurately analysed how the socialist society must utilize its combined social product in order to guarantee a steady increase in the material well-being of the masses on the basis of expanded reproduction and the onward movement of society. Even nowadays these conclusions by Marx teach us to realistically approach the solving of the questions of distribution and other social problems strictly in accordance with the level of development of the production forces, labor productivity and the effectiveness of production. It is precisely by linking the amount of consumption to the amount of labor that our party creates realistic foundations for the program of substantially raising the material well-being and the cultural level of the masses while securing growth in production and its effectiveness and taking into account the reverse influence which distribution exerts on it. The main principle of socialism as substantiated by Marx--"from everyone according to his ability, to everyone according to his work"--continues to be fully in force also at the stage of mature socialism. This principle distinguishes the socialist society from capitalism, where the exploiters appropriate other people's labor, and from full communism where the wealth will pour in an endless stream and full socioeconomic equality will be established (free, of course, from uniformity of interests, tastes, requirements and so forth).

Naturally, Marx and Engels wrote about socialism and communism as a prospect and a future. Nowadays, 100 years later and thanks to them, to Lenin and to the enormous accumulated experience of creating the new society, all that they predicted has become clearer and more obvious to us and even that which they could not have uncovered in detail because of the conditions of their time has now assumed the visible and concrete outlines of real socialism.

Soviet society has now reached the stage of mature socialism, and in a number of other socialist countries it is being successfully built. Thus, both Marx's prediction of full socialism and Lenin's idea of the constantly rising level of socialism's maturity--from its initial victory to its developed stage--have come true.



Of course, we are now at the very beginning of this stage. On the way we have to solve some tasks of the previous stage. Besides, within the framework of the first phase of the communist formation (and, therefore, under the conditions of mature socialism) some survivals of the past and manifestations of bureaucracy, departmentalism and parochialism still make themselves felt and must be decisively fought.

We also clearly realize that even mature socialism, which was established in our society quite recently, does not remain in one place but continuously develops, overcoming new contradictions and difficulties and objectively needing to perfect many of its aspects. Comrade Yu. V. Andropov spoke about this both in his report "Leninism as an Inexhaustible Source of the Revolutionary Energy and Creative Activity of the Masses" and in his subsequent speeches, including the one at the festive session marking the 60th anniversary of the USSR, and in his article "Karl Marx's Doctrine and Some Questions of Socialist Construction in the USSR." This is not accidental. At the moment this is the central question and the main content of the activity of the party and government at the present stage, because mature socialism is a necessary, protracted and obligatory period in the life of the society and a reflection of the dialectically complex and comprehensive nature of social development. At the same time this is also a movement toward full communism. The differences between the first and second phases of the communist formation are, as is well known, quite substantial both with regard to the level of the socioeconomic development of society and to the degree of consciousness of the masses. Lenin pointed out that it is not possible to reach the highest stage of the communist formation by mounting a cavalry attack, skipping the inevitable stages of the maturing of full communism.

Of course, everyone would like to open the doors leading to communism as soon as possible, but in politics it is not possible to behave like an impatient passenger who keeps thinking that the train is going too slowly and the stations lying in its way are to blame. This is wrong because the locomotive of history follows the objective laws of social development and moves in accordance with them. Whereas certain countries can arrive at socialism by skipping capitalism, directly from feudal or even tribal conditions, it is not possible to arrive at communism by skipping socialism and the stage of its maturity and the perfection of mature socialist social relations. Lenin wrote that socialism transforms the relations between the people only "to the extent to which economic transformations have been attained" (Complete Works, Vol. 33, p 94). It is necessary to take this into account always and in everything--be it concerning the problems of distribution, social equality or any others--in order to avoid the emergence of undesirable phenomena, complications and difficult situations. The basic principle here is the concept of mature socialism elaborated through the efforts of the CPSU and the fraternal parties which is an outstanding achievement of contemporary Marxist-Leninist theory and a concept which helps discover the concrete forms of the transition from the given state to a new and higher one. It is clear that this concept does not remain in one place but, on the contrary, constantly develops together with the perfection of the communism-building society.

In all its vast creative activity, while theoretically generalizing the collective experience of the masses, our Communist Party is always and in everything guided by the doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin and it creatively develops it in conformity with contemporary conditions. Thus, in his article "Marx's Doctrine and Some Questions of Socialist Construction in the USSR" Comrade Yu. V. Andropov directs the attention of our cadres to the fact that the "economic law which Marx considered to be the primary law based on collective production--the law of saving working time--is not yet in full operation in our country" (KOMMUNIST 1983, No. 3, p 16) and that it is necessary to tackle persistently the solution of all those problems which follow from this.

What are the main requirements of this law which Marx first mentions in his economic manuscript of 1857-1858?

The law of saving working time and distributing it in a planned manner among different production branches assigns us the goal of turning more decisively toward the predominantly intensive and quality-oriented factors of economic development which most fully correspond to the requirements of mature socialism and lead to communist abundance.

What is meant is, first of all, the correct and thrifty expenditure of working time and all labor and material resources. Indeed, raising the standard of living of the masses and creating the material conditions for their comprehensive development is directly proportionate to the growth of labor productivity, the perfection of production and enhancement of its effectiveness. It is precisely in the course of their creative labor in socialist enterprises that the formation and development of people's abilities and their natural talents also takes place; it is precisely work that gives a powerful impulse to their activity. The most vivid proof of this is socialist competition.

Therefore, the struggle against losses of working time, production losses and violations of labor discipline and the rational organization of the working place and the everyday conditions of production are the topical tasks of our time resulting from the principles proclaimed by the November (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the requirements of the objective laws of socialism, which Marx spoke about in his economic manuscript of 1857-1858. The violation of these requirements always strikes back and leads to negative phenomena in the development of production, in its various sectors and, correspondingly, in the other spheres of public life.

We are also talking of the effective implementation of the achievements of science and the most up-to-date technology, of their quickest possible introduction into production, of the effective utilization of the existing production potential and its modernization on the basis of achievements of the scientific-technical revolution and we are talking about perfecting the planning of the national economy management in accordance with the requirements of our society and of the well-balanced growth of all the branches of the economy.

Under socialist conditions the most up-to-date technical equipment--including the cybernetic instruments which take over to an ever increasing degree the basic operations from the sphere of physical and intellectual activity--not only helps increase material wealth on an unprecedented scale but also helps secure the creative development of the people both in the process of production and through accumulating free time for perfecting themselves intellectually outside the sphere of their professional work. This is why free time represents invaluable social wealth and must not be wasted. This also results from the objective laws of socialism, which Marx wrote about, and requires both great attention from the individual and solicitude for the individual. It requires, first and foremost, a reduction of manual, heavy and unqualified physical labor on the basis of the mechanization and automatization of production and reduction of the time required for housekeeping by improving public catering and municipal and everyday services, perfecting the work of transport and so forth.

Thus, the very progress of the socialist society and its onward movement toward communism leads to implementing the tasks of comprehensive intellectual enrichment of the individual in the process of his participation in managing production and all state and public affairs as well as the tasks of effectively utilizing the advantages of the socialist economic system which gives full scope to the development of science and technology, all production forces, culture and education. To make it short, it leads to the implementation of all those tasks which are set by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, the November (1982) CPSU Central Committee Plenum and other party documents.

This is a law-governed path leading from the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism to the decisions of our party congresses and from these to the practice of millions of people, which implements the ideas of scientific communism and which, in its turn, serves as the foundation of the new creative search and decisions within the framework of the Marxist-Leninist theory and politics. This path is organic because it incorporates the inseparable unity of the theory and method of Marxism-Leninism which is aimed at the cognition of the new phenomena presented by reality and is a vivid incarnation of revolutionary thought and revolutionary action. It is precisely to this aspect that Comrade Yu. V. Andropov draws our attention when he emphasizes that "he handles things correctly nowadays who--having asked himself the question 'What is socialism?'--turns first of all to the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin to get the answer. However, it is no longer possible to confine oneself to this alone. Nowadays the concept of 'socialism' cannot be explained otherwise than by taking into account the very rich practical experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries. This experience demonstrates how complex many problems are, problems rising on the path of socialist construction. However, it also attests that only socialism is capable of solving the most complex questions of social existence" (KOMMUNIST 1983, No. 3, pp 20-21).

Characterizing Marx's world outlook Engels wrote shortly before his death that it "does not offer ready-made dogmas but only points of departure for



further examination and the method for this investigation (Vol. 39, p 352). The works by the founders of Marxism published nowadays in such a complete version demonstrate the way in which Marx and Engels applied the method of materialistic dialectics to all the spheres of scientific knowledge and life. Everything they have accomplished in this respect is invaluable wealth, particularly in our complex times. Indeed, as much as certain phenomena and events may change with time, the principles of their scientific cognition and the principles of dialectical-materialistic thinking remain in force, just as the most significant results achieved with their help. In this respect the second edition of the WORKS by K. Marx and F. Engels instructs us in the use not of quotations and separate statements but of Marxism as a whole in our research of the new processes and real contradictions of public life, in the creative solution of new tasks and in the search for new forms of the onward movement. It instructs us how to proceed, avoiding mistakes from the phenomena to the general theoretical conclusions, and how to apply the general principles and ideas of Marxism in practice, avoiding mistakes, erroneous actions and blunders in the course of solving social problems.

Everything said above acquires particular significance nowadays, because in its onward movement, in the process of the growth of the creative forces and in the course of the struggle between that which is new and that which is old, against stagnation and the inertia of the past, our life continually puts new problems in front of us, problems which as yet have no ready-made solutions. As Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized at the November CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we will have to find answers to these questions. He pointed out that we will have to find them collectively by summing up our own and world experience on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology and by accumulating the knowledge of our best practical workers and scientists.

Speaking of the achievements of Marxism in the 19th century even a few years before the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin expressed his firm conviction that the "approaching historical era will bring Marxism as a proletarian doctrine even greater triumphs" (Complete Works, Vol. 23, p 4). Life soon confirmed this prophesy.

The Great October aroused and brought into action the powerful forces of social progress. The revolutionary renewal of the world got underway. The Soviet people built a socialist society which has reached its maturity and is now marching toward communism with a firm step. The community of the socialist states--a part of the world which is completely free of social and national oppression, economic crises, unemployment and degradation of intellectual values--is gaining strength. The colonial system of imperialism has collapsed and on its ruins dozens of independent states have formed, a number of whom have chosen the path of socialist orientation.

Born of October, the international communist movement has spread its influence in both hemispheres of the earth. Whereas the League of Communists founded by Marx and Engels--the prototype of the proletarian party--numbered only a few hundred members, nowadays communist parties function in almost 100



countries, and there are more than 70 million communists on our planet. Having captivated the minds of the workers' class the militant appeal of the League of Communists "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" became a powerful reality. The principles of solidarity and united actions, defended by the communist and workers' movement, nowadays meet with a very ardent response among all the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces.

It is precisely the socialist community and the international workers' class who, while defending their class positions, under contemporary conditions come out as carriers of the highest universal values and the most active and consistent fighters for progress. The social experience of our century undeniably attests that communists were and continue to be the main uniting force of the world revolutionary process and, to use the words of the "Communist Party Manifesto," the most decisive part of the workers of all countries who always impel mankind to move forward.

Marx and Engels wrote that the time will come when the workers' class will be capable of "dictating peace where its so-called masters shout war" (Vol. 16, p 373). They scientifically substantiated that the international principle of the new society, which will be formed after the victory of the workers' class "will be peace" (Vol. 17, p 5). Indeed, after the October victory the policy of peace became the policy of the first socialist state in history, and after the formation of the world socialist system it became the state policy course of all the countries of the great socialist community. At the November CPSU Central Committee Plenum Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said: "Securing stable peace and defending the peoples' right of independence and social progress are the invariable goals of our foreign policy. In their struggle for these goals the leadership of the party and the government will act in a principled, consistent and well-weighed out manner."

Nowadays it is clearer than ever before that the cohesion of all the revolutionary forces on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, their resolute struggle against imperialist reaction, which is pushing the world toward nuclear catastrophe, their solidarity with real socialism and the support of the just cause of the workers' class, all the working people and all democratic forces--these are life's powerful demands. Therefore, it is natural that the progressive people on our planet are thirsting for the Marxist world outlook which makes them staunch, tempered and principled in their struggle against the forces of social evil. They realize ever more deeply that the communist world outlook is the most reliable lever of transforming the world on the basis of humanitarian principles and for the sake of the well-being of all the working people and all the peoples on the globe of earth.

The new edition of K. Marx's and F. Engels' works satisfy the growing interest of the masses in Marxism as well as the requirements of the theoretical work and ideological struggle for the communist ideals and for transforming the workers' cause, as Lenin wrote, into the "vanguard and vital cause of all mankind" (Complete Works, Vol. 4, p 272). There is no doubt that this edition will prove to be an important instrument of forming communist party-mindedness and ideological conviction of the people and will

help them master more deeply the Marxist-Leninist doctrine as a complete scientific theory, providing correct guidance in the complex phenomena of contemporary life and helping them participate even more actively in the solution of topical problems from Marxist-Leninist positions.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

CSO: 1802/11

## SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE SPHERE OF LABOR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 35-46

[Article by B. Rakitskiy, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress defined the 1980s as a major new step in building communism, in the course of which the fullest possible utilization of the possibilities and advantages of mature socialism will be ensured and the material and spiritual wealth of society and its economic and scientific and technical potential increased significantly. Some of the most important trends in social progress are making profound changes in labor, which is the most important realm of human activities, improving and easing its conditions, providing extensive opportunities for highly productive and creative work, making considerable progress in the elimination of major disparities between mental and physical work and converting agricultural into a variety of industrial labor. All of this is related to qualitative changes in the material and technical base, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, the intensification of public production and its improved efficiency.

Indeed, the reorganization of the material and technical base means making substantial changes in the social circumstances of labor, its nature and content and in the specific conditions governing the activities of tens of millions of working people.

### I

Most extensive socioeconomic changes in the field of labor have been made under the Soviet system in our country. Lenin's projection of the two decisive aspects of this process proved to be accurate--a qualitatively higher type of social labor organization has been reached and a new attitude toward it on the part of the working people themselves has taken place.

Socialism enhanced labor activities and converted them into the main factor defining the position of man in society. Labor, free from exploitation, has become a universal social value. Its historical development has followed a new channel toward complete socioeconomic equality, and has gradually converted socially useful and creative efforts, which bring moral satisfaction, into a most urgent human need. Such labor is increasingly becoming a universal socially guaranteed norm. A new attitude of man toward labor and

a new type of labor management appeared and were established. On the basis of democratic centralism, this made it possible to ensure planned social labor and voluntary and conscious discipline, to enhance the material, moral and creative interest of the people in their work and to organize and develop socialist competition.

Such a considerable progress in sociolabor relations is achieved on the basis of the systematic expansion of the economic potential and the creation of a material and technical foundation of a new type. Successes in the economic and social areas predetermine the contemporary level of possibilities in our country and the nature of the advantages of the socioeconomic system, which could and should be maximally utilized in formulating and resolving new large-scale problems related to social progress.

A material and technical base consistent with the development of socialism was laid in our country after the foundations for socialism had been laid. Today the Soviet Union has reached the stage of advanced socialism on its own foundation, in the course of which the reorganization of all social relations and processes on the basis of principles inherent in the new system is nearing its completion. The effect of its objective laws is given full scope and the social system is acquiring an increasing organic integrity and dynamism. The contemporary development of Soviet society is characterized by such qualitative features as the appearance of real prerequisites and objective need for the practical utilization of mature socialist forms of socioeconomic processes. This radically changes the very approach to labor problems and to ensuring their interconnection with the development of equipment, technology and production organization.

During the period of laying the material and technical foundations for socialism we were largely forced to duplicate the nature of the technology which existed in the developed capitalist countries. Nevertheless, even under these circumstances we were guided by the aspiration to develop our own means and methods for its utilization. We were essentially able to accomplish this thanks to the socialist organization of the production and labor processes, the unified national economic plan, democratic centralized management and other socialist advantages. The radical change in the social nature of labor was ensured and, to a certain extent, specifically socialist objectives and possibilities appeared for enriching the content and improving labor conditions despite the essentially similar technological socialist and capitalist production systems.

A situation in which socialist production has not as yet fully revealed the specific nature of its own approaches and solutions and ways in the field of technology creates certain difficulties in the application of the socioeconomic advantages of socialism. This applies to the development of labor as well.

Actually, over several decades the contemporary system of technological developments was molded essentially within capitalist social conditions, in which there are no strategic objectives such as the free and comprehensive development of the working people and the conversion of labor into a prime



vital necessity. Things related to this purpose were not taken into consideration in selecting directions for technical progress. Changes in socioeconomic and production conditions of activity developed only as consequences of technical progress. Progressing primarily in the course of such a mechanism for the development of production forces, socialism was forced to tolerate a certain priority of technology and economics over socioeconomic problems. The preservation of such a system for the reproduction process prevented the new system from fully displaying its advantages and seizing the historical initiative in shaping the productive forces of mankind.

By nature mature socialism is a society which follows its own path of development not only in socioeconomic relations but in production forces as well. In its developed aspect socialist labor should trigger the functioning of a system of suitable material and technical facilities. The qualitative feature of the material and technical base of socialism, which develops into the material and technical foundations for communism, is that equipment, technology and production organization assume a social purposefulness based on the need for progress toward full social equality and, in the case of labor, the need to convert socialist into communist labor.

The basic contradiction in the planned development of socialist labor today is that the changes in its socioeconomic and production conditions are still largely the consequence of technical progress, whereas mature socialism, which develops on its own specific material and technical foundation, objectively should be related less to socioeconomic consequences than planned and systematically achieved socioeconomic results of scientific and technical progress. Society must deliberately shape its own technology guided above all by the requirements of socioeconomic efficiency.

The main task of reorganizations in the labor area in the 1980s and, obviously, the 1990s, will be the fuller mastery of the possibilities and advantages of socialism. The conversion of the production process to a specifically socialist type of technological and organizational solution is a prerequisite for its successful implementation. This calls for a conversion to the type of development of production forces in which socioeconomic problems (including the growth of socialist into communist labor) become initial and technical and economic solutions become consistent with it.

Such a radical conversion requires not only serious improvements in centralized management (increasing the role of forecasts and target programming, mastering long-term planning, elaboration of a unified state technical policy and methods for its implementation, and the improvement of other aspects of the economic mechanism), but the availability of strictly scientific and technical possibilities as well. The contemporary scientific and technical revolution offers suitable and adequate opportunities to this effect.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution major and basic discoveries in various fields of science and truly great technical inventions exceed the limits of their scientific or technological sector and influence related sectors as well. At this point they become a comprehensive system of radical production improvements. This enables us to make a qualitative leap in our knowledge of nature and the utilization of its laws and

to convert scientific thinking into a force which directly and more efficiently reorganizes the production process and efficiently restructures it on a new basis. Such is the nature of the scientific and technical revolution embodied in the comprehensive radical restructuring of the production process. All of this considerably broadens the multiplicity of technical possibilities of its development. The utilization of one or another opportunity decisively depends on the criteria used in its evaluation and choice of variants. By virtue of their opposite nature capitalism and socialism set basically different socioeconomic criteria of the effectiveness of scientific and technical progress. Hence the different ways followed in technological progress.

The 24th CPSU Congress itself clearly formulated the following task of historical importance: "organically to combine the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system, and to develop more extensively specifically socialist forms of combining science with production." This stipulation was further concretized in the 26th congress materials. The social direction of scientific and technical progress and the subordination of the processes of development of production forces to socioeconomic tasks is the essence of said organic combination. The formulation of the question to the effect that socialism broadens the range of application of machines or, in general, the boundaries of technical progress in production is valid only in the case of undeveloped socialism. Mature socialism, which develops on its own foundation, leads to an even deeper change: essentially it opens a new way for the development of equipment, technology and production organization.

The planned development of socialist labor and its growth into communist labor presumes the elaboration of the essential requirements related to scientific and technical progress. Such requirements and their practical application are a variety of ways and means for combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system specifically inherent in socialism and ensuring the necessary consistency between technical and socioeconomic development. In this case the mechanism which ensures the social direction in the development of the material and technical base of society, the mechanism of the social direction followed in scientific and technical progress above all, plays an important role.

Entirely consistent with developed socialism is the approach to such tasks from the positions of a centrally controlled planned economy. Since the scientific and technical revolution offers sufficiently broad prospects and real possibilities of choosing ways for technological development, the socialist state has prerequisites which favor the planned development of technology in the future based on the strategic socioeconomic objectives of socialism. It is thus that the unified and technical policy proves to be organically combined with socioeconomic policy which, unquestionably, retains its priority status. This is perhaps legitimate simply because equipment and technology do not have their specific development targets (at most they maintain a certain inertia), whereas such interests are always present in society and in social groups. Socialist society, with its previously unheard-of

level of unity, demonstrates particularly clearly the leading nature, the priority of policy (social targets) over the economy and technology.

In fact, in contemporary reality the opportunities and advantages of real socialism in the area of the planned shaping of the aspect of equipment and technology in the future are by far not completely or adequately manifested. The reasons may be reduced to the fact that for a long time socialism lacked its own technological foundation. In applying (although, naturally, with changes) technical solutions which were reached under capitalist conditions, our society has been forced to tolerate the appearance of a number of socially undesirable consequences of scientific and technical progress and some inconsistencies between one technical solution or another and the socio-economic tasks of socialism.

It is this actual underlining that created (and will continue to create) concepts regarding requirements facing scientific and technical progress, according to which they must consist of the gradual elimination of the negative consequences developing in the course of production progress. According to this view, it is necessary and quite adequate to formulate and implement programs for the systematic elimination of phenomena which disagree with resolving problems of ensuring in the future full social equality and the growth of socialist into communist labor. Quite recently the list of features to be put behind and eliminated included heavy and unskilled labor, harmful working conditions, and so on. Today the list has been extended (partially through the inclusion of new elements and partially the refining of older ones) and includes the extreme simplification of the labor process, work monotony, concealed side effects on the body, nerve-mental overloading of the possibilities of developing the personality of the worker, and others. We are defining in increasing detail what must not be in the future, what must be gotten rid of and that against which the worker must be insured. This trend in the development of requirements regarding scientific and technical progress is justified and fruitful but insufficient.

The focal point of all efforts to ensure the social direction of scientific and technical progress and the formulation of requirements facing it and facing the planned development of equipment, technology and the organization of socialist production must be the study of the objective targets (needs) of the socialist society in the area of improving socioeconomic and production labor conditions. These objectives must not only be interpreted but "translated" into the language of practical solutions and turned into objectives-levels of specific development stages and formulated as legal instruments and assignments.

## II

Ensuring the proper social direction of the interrelated development of labor and the material and technical base of the production process presumes today a qualitative improvement in the level of labor management and paralleling scientific and technical progress.



In this case, unquestionably, upgrading the scientific substantiation and strategic accuracy of plans is the determining direction. This must be secured at all levels and stages in planning work. Preplanning preparations imply the formulation of a scientific labor forecast (including a description of the ways and stages of its further socialization, enriched content and improved conditions). The purpose of this forecast is to become an instrument for the substantiation of sociolabor requirements for scientific and technical progress and the formulation of long-term plans and comprehensive target programs in the field of labor.

At the stage of development of plan systems (long-term, five-year, annual) qualitative changes may be achieved above all by improving the methods used in long-term and current planning of labor indicators and assignments as part of the social programs of such plans. Such assignments must be made broader and more comprehensive. However, the depth and purpose of planned decisions should not be replaced by an eclectic multiplicity of indicators.

Target programs may be of substantial help in improving planning. In itself, the target program method is not new to the Soviet economy. The task is to apply it in the 1980s-1990s not only in resolving the problems of particular national economic importance (space research, development of petroleum and gas deposits in Western Siberia, and so on) but also in resolving a far broader range of "ordinary" socioeconomic problems. Here again specific features and difficulties exist. We must master methods for the formulation and efficient implementation of comprehensive target programs in the field of labor (such as the program for reducing manual labor and others). Furthermore, a certain number of labor management problems must be resolved in drafting and applying comprehensive target scientific and technical and economic programs (such as the Food Program or the program for the production of consumer goods) and programs for the development of regional and territorial-production complexes. Suitable methods to this effect have either not been developed to begin with or else require major improvements.

In our view, the social trend in the development of production forces (and interconnected material and technical and human factors) of the stipulated system of plans should be preserved in the course of their implementation. In this case a great deal depends on the central management organs and labor collectives on an equal basis. Virtually all sociolabor processes can take place successfully only if combined with the disciplined implementation of state assignments, norms and economic management rules and the development of the initiative of production collectives and individual workers. This applies both to improving the organization and norming of labor on the basis of state planning assignments and strengthening labor incentives (material, moral, creative) in their unity and interconnection, as well as the comprehensive advancement of the mechanism of planned training, distribution and redistribution of manpower resources in the national economy. The employment system under socialism must be consistently based on humanistic principles, above all on the interests of man, his right to work and aspiration to an increasingly free and comprehensive development in labor above all, thanks to and in connection with socially useful labor.



The social trend in the development of the entire "man-technology" system is ensured under socialism the more reliably the more successfully all sides of social life are democratized. In this connection it is particularly important to single out a feature such as the further increase in the role of labor collectives in resolving problems of improving socioeconomic and production working conditions, developing a socialist and communist attitude toward labor, upgrading the organization and efficiency of socialist competition, developing labor activeness and strengthening labor discipline.

Under contemporary conditions requirements regarding the proportional development of labor within the social reproduction system as a whole substantially increase and become more complex. The common foundation of said proportionality remains the same, i.e., consistency between the number and structure of jobs in the national economy and the number and professional-skill cadre structure. In order to establish this proportionality in the 1920s and subsequently to maintain it consciously throughout the decades which followed, we had to learn how to defeat unemployment and dislocation, to create several million jobs every year, to develop new educational and vocational training systems, to formulate a socialist government employment system, and so on. Today as well the availability of jobs and a job placement situation favorable to the population are not maintained automatically. They are systematically provided through a system of government measures.

However, the steady increase in the role which social aspects play in planned development leads to the enrichment of the proportionality criterion itself. Whereas previously this criterion was reduced primarily to the need to guarantee a job to everyone, remunerated according to its quantity and quality, today, under developed socialist conditions, this is no longer sufficient (although it remains necessary). In the 1980s the balancing of jobs with labor resources must be ensured--increasingly as time goes on--on the basis of the substantially enriched content of the right to work, which has now obtained a qualitative development. This means that the state guarantees to all able-bodied people not only a job (paid according to labor) but the right to choose a profession, type of employment and work consistent with vocation, capability, professional training, education and social requirements (USSR Constitution, Article 40).

Consequently, the balance between jobs and manpower resources (i.e., a favorable job situation which would exclude unemployment) must be increasingly ensured through the creation of the type of socioeconomic and production conditions in which the possibilities of developing and displaying work capabilities more useful to society are systematically increased. This is a major social task the implementation of which will result in a substantial qualitative improvement of labor circumstances. It will be a proof of the maturity of socialism and a new step in converting socialist into communist labor.

The development and enrichment of the proportionality criterion in the development of labor and the material and technical base reflect the law inherent in socialism according to which the working people and their labor are considered not from strictly economic positions (primarily as a manpower re-

source and production factor) but from social positions--above all as the focal point of the supreme objectives of social progress in the achievements of which economic development is merely a means. To socialism man is both a target of development and the creator of the conditions for reaching this target. The enrichment of the proportionality criterion in the development of labor presumes a substantial modernizing of the ways and means of resolving two interrelated problems: on the one hand, the development of the overall availability of jobs through purposeful changes in technical facilities, production technology and production conditions and, on the other, the development of the main social production force--the working people.

Improved job availability organically combines the practical solution of the problems of upgrading the social and economic efficiency of the production process. In order to become socially efficient, the current and future measures aimed at developing overall job availability must be subordinated to the essential implementation of three major assignments: improving the meaning of labor, improving its production conditions and ensuring the target-setting (and, therefore, criterial) role of the scientific organization of labor in the development of new equipment and technology and improving the organization of output and the production environment. It is only by observing such requirements for upgrading economic efficiency that the growth of labor productivity and improved work quality can be considered as actual socially useful results. The observance of such "subordination" in the case of social and economic efficiency is a manifestation of the advantages and humanism of socialism.

The task of systematically improving overall job availability as a prerequisite for upgrading the meaning of labor and improving production conditions systematically and in full can be achieved only on the basis of a socially directed technical improvement of the production process. In the formulation of a unified state technical policy, the concept of sectorial technical development in drafting plans for scientific and technical progress on all levels must be based primarily on the task of upgrading the meaning of labor and improving its production conditions. The current state of the work on the formulation and systematization of the socio-target requirements concerning scientific and technical progress does not as yet enable us to formulate such requirements in full and with a necessary interconnection. However, step by step science and practice are advancing precisely in that direction. In our view, it is a matter of formulating a single governmental program for the development of the sum total of jobs in the national economy, the purpose of which is the systematic enhancement of the meaningfulness of and improvement in working conditions and reaching a high level in their satisfaction.

Let us turn to practical experience. In defining the program for social development for the 10th Five-Year Plan, the 25th CPSU Congress called for improving labor socioeconomic and production conditions, strengthening its creative nature and comprehensively reducing manual, unskilled and heavy physical work. In order to implement this decision, in the past several years target programs were drafted for reducing manual labor in oblasts, republics, sectors, enterprises and associations. The initiative of the

Zaporozhye people working under the slogan of "Shift Manual Labor to Machines," became popular. Interesting experience was acquired in Latvia, Leningrad and several other areas.

Local and sectorial programs made it possible to see better the range of problems which were to be resolved and to highlight jobs where labor should be mechanized. Practical work was energized at enterprises and associations in reducing manual labor. However, objective hindrances obstructing this process were manifested soon afterwards.

Above all, this applied to the insufficient amounts and imperfect structure in the production of the necessary mechanization facilities. The existing disproportion between supply and demand for such facilities is not accidental. For decades mechanization was carried out partially. It did not cover comprehensively all interrelated production processes. The greatest attention was paid to improving so-called basic operations and production lines, whereas the development of auxiliary and support operations fell far behind. Attention was equally focused on the structure of the production of mechanization facilities in which the role of auxiliary and support operations is traditionally insignificant. As a result, the number of auxiliary workers frequently increased faster than the number of basic workers.

A situation was created as a result of which domestic machine-building is unable today to provide adequate assistance in the reconstruction of most jobs requiring manual labor, i.e., in the mechanization of auxiliary and support operations. The result is not only a slow elimination of manual labor but an economically inefficient waste of mechanization facilities. Thus, it has been computed that the cost of mechanizing a single job in auxiliary production in machine building averages 3,000 rubles as against 10,000 rubles in basic production. Considering the lagging of design developments and production of machines and equipment for the mechanization of auxiliary production, only 10 percent of capital outlays are channeled into this profitable area. In material production as a whole the ratio between the cost of mechanization of a single auxiliary and basic job remains the same, while the ratio of funds allocated for the mechanization of basic and auxiliary production is 80:20.

The situation is worsened by the fact that suitable machines have neither been designed nor built to replace a number of manual operations. Approximate estimates show that technical solutions for the mechanization of at least two-thirds of manual operations are unavailable. Naturally, something can be achieved in this respect on a local basis, and some systems, equipment and mechanisms can be manufactured with the help of primitive or semi-primitive methods. However, no substantial reduction in manual labor outlays can be achieved through such methods. The reason is that industry is continuing to apply industrial methods for the reproduction of essential means for partial mechanization, whereas local mechanization programs are trying to reduce this incompleteness with the help of very primitive methods.

In this case a radical turn on the scale of the entire national economy may be provided by the comprehensive target program for reducing manual labor



described in the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress as one of the large-scale programs the elaboration and gradual implementation of which must be given priority. Estimates indicate that without the implementation of a comprehensive target program the share of manual labor without machines and mechanisms will account, in 20 years, for 25 percent in industry (32.8 percent in 1979) and 42 percent in construction (49 percent in 1979). The program for reducing manual labor should be such as to put an end to such trends and speed up matters by factors of approximately 3-4.

An essentially similar situation has developed in reducing the use of labor under health-harming conditions. It has been determined that here again the problem cannot be resolved without a governmental target program. Some other problems could be named as well which have become urgently topical and require their formulation and resolution within the framework of general governmental measures. Studies made by the Scientific Research Institute of Labor show that problems demanding an urgent solution may be graded in terms of urgency as follows: first, a drastic reduction in outlays of heavy physical labor and labor under harmful conditions; second, reduction of monotonous, unattractive and uncreative labor. It is only after their solution (or after their urgency has been substantially reduced) that adequate priority can be given to reaching the meaningfulness of labor at each job.

In this connection, practical activities in the 1980s should include the following problems the solution to which is unquestionably obvious and justified:

Reducing the number of jobs requiring unskilled and underskilled manual and heavy physical labor;

Improving labor conditions, reducing the number and, subsequently, totally eliminating jobs and production operations dangerous to the health.

Naturally, such efforts cannot resolve the entire set of problems related to upgrading the meaningfulness and improving working conditions in production. They can be adopted as priority programs for action in developing the overall number of jobs. The 26th CPSU Congress formulated assignments on the elaboration and development of the production of machines, mechanisms and equipment needed to resolve said problems within the framework of priority comprehensive target programs aimed at improving production conditions.

Certain successes have already been achieved. New machines and mechanisms are being created for loading and unloading operations and new technologies are being developed which exclude heavy and dangerous operations. Some noiseless weaving and spinning looms have been tested. A method has been found to lower the toxicity of effluent gases. The list of such examples could be extended. The conversion of such encouraging accomplishments into daily practice is an urgent national economic need.

Today the difficulty is that along with extensive outlays for reducing adverse labor conditions and improving existing jobs a number of jobs are created which are no longer consistent with increased requirements of the



individual workers and society in terms of the nature, content and conditions of the work. Unquestionably, during the next 5 to 15 years this disparity will be aggravated and efforts will be required to surmount it. Adverse factors in shaping labor careers will appear. That is precisely why we must as of now concentrate on reducing the use of manual, particularly heavy physical labor and labor under harmful circumstances, and strengthen governmental requirements governing new jobs.

The initial steps in the formulation of stricter sociolabor requirements governing jobs were made during the 10th Five-Year Plan. They included measures in the fields of labor safety, controlling admissible harmful effects on the workers, and the elaboration for the first time in the world of labor safety standards and the development of a system of such standards. In accordance with the resolutions of the 25th CPSU Congress intersectorial stipulations and norms regulating the scientific organization of labor were approved and applied. They are mandatorily taken into consideration in designing new and reconstructing existing enterprises and developing technological processes and equipment. However, all such measures and documents, despite their entire importance, should be considered as essentially no more than preparatory. They are unable as yet to change approaches to the solution of the main problems of the interrelated development of labor and the material and technical base of production, which took decades to develop.

The change which must be made in this area in the 1980s is to convert labor safety and scientific organization requirements into criteria governing the choice of socially admissible (i.e., socially efficient) variants of technological solutions and changes in labor production conditions and environment.

The studies made by the Scientific Research Institute of Labor revealed the following specific means for accomplishing this change.

Above all, the set of measures aimed at improving labor conditions includes increased outlays for ensuring the safety of labor tools and technological processes in the overall cost of design and research. It would be expedient to introduce in the technical documentations of new machines, equipment and technological processes indicators characterizing labor conditions. Periodical control over their observation must be instituted. Today design engineers are insufficiently familiar with ergonomics and the requirements of a scientific organization of labor. This is explained by major gaps in their training and insufficient control over the inclusion of stipulations and norms related to a scientific organization of labor in designs. Practical experience indicates that the most efficient factors for improving labor conditions are today in the hands of designers and engineers. Therefore, each ruble invested in improving the training of the creators of equipment should yield substantial returns.

Naturally, no incentives or additional outlays would yield the desired results if technical and economic indicators retain their priority in assessing the effectiveness of new equipment and technology. The priority should be assigned to the social indicators (consistency with ergonomic requirements,

reduced number of people working under adverse circumstances and recipients of benefits and compensations and reduced outlays for such purposes). The following is an important factor as well: foreign trade organizations and other departments which purchase equipment abroad must demand of the suppliers to meet the standards and requirements of the socialist countries regarding production labor conditions.

In order for the stipulations of a scientific organization of labor to become the criteria applied in the formulation of concepts for the scientific and technical development of the sectors and in designing, creating and applying new equipment and technology and in modernizing, improving the efficiency and reconstructing production facilities and workplaces, in all cases, as we compare the various alternatives of separating human from equipment functions, the stipulations of the scientific organization of labor must become the initial and decisive factors which ensure the meaningfulness and conditions of labor on the steadily rising level stipulated by the state. In our choice of variants we must adopt those which offer scope for increasing skills, and upgrading the activeness and initiative of the working people and the future tightening up of state requirements governing the standard of parameters characterizing the physical and emotional pressure on man in the course of the labor process, sanitary and esthetic labor conditions and amenities offered the working people at work.

Particular attention should be paid to observing scientific organization of labor requirements which take into consideration the new socialist nature of labor and the new attitude of the people toward it. This includes, among others, giving the worker the opportunity actively to influence at his workplace the collective mastery of assignments, exchange and duplication of progressive experience, development of competition and participation in management. The scientific organization of socialist labor must be built also on the basis of strengthening voluntary and conscious labor discipline. That is precisely why the currently reconstructed, designed and created jobs, sectors, production facilities and enterprises must ensure every worker and the labor collective high-level satisfaction with the work and adequate scope for labor and manifestation of initiative and independent action. The broader the opportunities to display independence that technology and production organization grant the more substantial become the objective prerequisites for strengthening conscious labor discipline, which is a major social factor in increasing efficiency. The observance of such scientific organization of labor stipulations is consistent with the task of organically combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism.

The planning and implementation of changes in labor should be conducted with an eye to the future. Under mature socialist conditions successes achieved in resolving one or several problems (although quite important socially) frequently prove insufficient in terms of the successful implementation of the overall social program. The labor of one category of workers or another may be eased; one sector or another may be mechanized and the prestige of one profession or another may be enhanced without, however, reaching the main target--substantial quality changes in labor as a whole. This is the only

objective which will provide us with an accurate guideline. That is why it is of essential importance strictly to observe the requirements of a comprehensive approach to resolving problems of the scientific organization of labor, i.e., to ensure a relative equalization and scientific organization of the entire amount of labor in a production collective, sector and region (or city). A different approach may lead (and already has led) to the appearance of undesirable gaps among the various worker categories in terms of the meaningfulness and conditions of their labor in the course of applying mechanization and automation.

In the realm of labor, which is the main area of activity of the Soviet people, the approach based on the stipulations of the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which calls for strengthening the organization and efficiency of the work on all levels of our social and economic mechanism, is fully applicable. "The purpose of the party's efforts to improve management and enhance the level of organization, efficiency and planning, state and labor discipline," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov writes, "consists not only of eliminating some shortcomings and difficulties, which is of tremendous importance in itself, but also, in the final account, of strengthening even further the foundations on which the socialist way of life is built."

The profoundly scientific assumption was formulated at the 26th CPSU Congress to the effect that the establishment of a classless social structure will take place in its essential and basic aspects within the historical framework of mature socialism. It is self-evident that changes in the realm of labor will be a decisive component of this process. As a real and realistic humanism, the socialist system rests its social progress on the firm base of the development of the material and technical foundation for production and for involving scientific and technical progress in building communism. Socialist labor is one of the specific areas in which the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution become organically combined with the advantages of socialism. The implementation of profound changes in labor, as earmarked at the 26th CPSU Congress, means resolving one of the key problems of the country's economic and social development in the 1980s and ensuring the prerequisites for subsequent successful socioeconomic progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## COMPONENTS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 47-55

[Article by Prof V. Davidovich, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The path of social progress is complex and contradictory. Its general line--the rise of mankind to higher forms of social existence--is achieved in the course of the twists and turns of historical development. The legitimacy of this motion was convincingly substantiated by Marxist-Leninist theory and is steadily confirmed by social practice. The toiling masses, headed by the working class, are engaged in a persistent struggle for establishing social justice on our planet and creating truly human living conditions for all people.

The concept of justice as an integrative assessment of social relations, developed through our history, was hammered out by the entire course of development of global culture. It holds a leading position in the common rank of spiritual values close to the hearts of the simple people. The inspiring idea of justice is an organic part of the Marxist-Leninist outlook and the most important communist ideal.

To us social justice is not a pious wish expressed in an abstract or loose form. It is a very specific concept the nature and content of which are entirely clear as are the ways and means for the implementation of this ideal. Social justice is an expression of true equality among people, an equality which is not formally interpreted but which means the creation of opportunities "for ensuring the total well-being and free comprehensive development of all members of society" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 6, p 232).

The dialectical-materialistic approach to the problem of social justice indicates the need for revolutionary struggle for its achievement and the elimination of the exploitation of labor, social inequality and all forms of oppression of man by man. The revolutionary reorganization of social foundations, i.e., replacing private with public ownership of productive capital, the establishment on this basis of collectivistic social relations and the elimination of antagonistic classes and the subsequent gradual advance of the new society toward full social homogeneity and the elimination of major disparities between town and country and between people engaged in physical and mental work are the necessary prerequisites for the creation of the most favorable conditions for achieving an abundance of material and cultural



goods and, consequently, ensuring the full well-being and free exchange of activities and, thus, reaching the comprehensive development of all members of society.

The methodology of dialectical materialism also requires a specific historical approach to the problem of social justice. This is the only explanation of the reason for which it cannot be achieved in a class-antagonistic and exploiting society and the type of qualitative characteristics which mark the stages of its establishment following the victory of the socialist revolution.

## I

The question of justice, conceived as an objective, assessment, principle and social ideal, is hardly meaningless. The point is that the concept of justice, like many other concepts which express superior values, is deeply historical. Sometimes its semantic cover and identical expression conceal diametrically opposed meanings. Life provides innumerable examples of the unconscientious and self-seeking application of this idea by political demagogues and falsifiers. The banners of justice have been frequently waved by those who engage in sinister and unjust actions concealed behind them. Dyed-in-the-wool nationalists and religious fanatics, right-wing conservative "hawks" and liberal phrase-mongers, and left- and right-wing extremist terrorists and shameless financial operators love to talk about justice.

Let us point out that the understanding of justice has long been marked by the imprint of its interpretation in the spirit of the rules and norms of private ownership and mercantile relations. For a long time the notorious equivalent exchange based on market relations and the law of supply and demand served theoreticians as a conceptual "model" of justice. The approach to it as an exchange formula is very typical of many hundreds of works on justice written by bourgeois authors. Naturally, this approach is concealed and embellished by historical exclamations, references to God and morality, and so on.

Reality convincingly proves that a class-antagonistic society neither has nor could have a universal interpretation of good and evil and justice and injustice. What the bourgeois considers the embodiment of justice becomes to the working people the merciless suppression of their hopes, refusal to satisfy minimal needs and crying injustice. To economically and politically ruling classes justice has always been associated with the consolidation of hierarchical inequality and excessive preservation of property rights and elitist privileges.

However, a different concept of justice developed in the minds of the working people. It embodies the class interests of the oppressed and universally significant features. The idea of justice deeply penetrates mass consciousness, the way of life and mores, the social mentality and inner world of the individual. It is less intellectually analyzed or theoretically interpreted than conceived almost subconsciously and occasionally with extreme clarity. As practical experience indicates, sometimes the people are unable rationally to substantiate their assessments of justice or injustice of one human action

or another, an action committed by the authorities or an economic decision. However, they feel this directly, intuitively, as though they weigh a specific action or decision on the "inner scales" of morality and justice. This feeling must be taken into consideration, studied and interpreted. It is a concentration of the historical experience of the people's masses and the wisdom of the centuries.

Operating as a concept of sociophilosophical theory, justice formulates in a generalized fashion the principle of relations between society and the individual and among classes and social groups. It provides a basic characterization of activities within the conflicting unity between it and its results.

The radical change of the entire system of social relations, including those between society and the individual, is a decisive prerequisite for achieving social justice. The social system and way of life in our society, based on the principles of collectivism, the elimination of class and national antagonisms and the appearance of the Soviet people as a new historical community, give the concept of justice a different outline. In our country the ties between the individual and society are not determined by the affiliation of an individual with a hostile class. The process of rapprochement among friendly classes and social groups, which leads to its completion within developed socialism, makes relations between individual and society more transparent and direct than ever before in history. The nature of social justice under our circumstances cannot be understood without a consideration of these circumstances.

The elimination of socioclass confrontation removed anything which could deform and hinder the exchange of activities and their results among people and between society as a whole and the individual. In formulating the historical-materialistic understanding of the world and man, Marx and Engels rejected as groundless and speculative all attempts to consider social life on the basis of a "historical" abstraction in general, "man" in general, and so on. Living and real people--the "real individuals"--who are not locked within their own selves but are interrelated through social and, above all, production relations, are an entity known as society. Ever since Marx published his theses on Feuerbach all Marxists have accepted as mandatory the fact that the essence of man as a social being represents the sum total of all social relations. It is equally unquestionable that such relations find their individual embodiment in the personality. These are the fundamental concepts of our theory.

They should be recalled because it is precisely they which provide the angle from which the problem of social justice must be considered. Its solution requires a clear elimination of metaphysical extremes which ignore the conflicting identification or reciprocal transference between the personal and the social.

We reject the individualistic view on justice born of the antagonistic system of social atomism and which is richly blossoming in the decadent atmosphere of contemporary capitalism. Extreme individualism locks the personality

within itself and gauges all and everything according to its own petty dimensions. An individual with an exaggerated love of self and an egocentric view on the world considers just only that which benefits himself, his appetites passions and whims. Such a position is profoundly antisocial.

Equally unacceptable to us is a rejection of the value and self-value of the individual and his vital needs and demands. Such views turn people into anonymous interchangeable parts within the soulless inimical social mechanism. The conversion of the individual merely into a means for achieving impersonal objectives is inhuman. The moral consciousness of Soviet society unconditionally condemns any attempt at viewing people according to the principle that you cannot make an omelet without breaking the egg. The party's slogan "Everything in the Name of Man and for the Good of Man" is a practical-political and truly just expression of the supreme task and objective of the communist renovation of life.

Society and the individual are not two separate formations. On the contrary, these are two sides of a dialectical unity which reciprocally presume and supplement each other. In the language of dialectics, relations between them in our society may be described as a nonantagonistic contradiction. Without the individuals which make it, society is nothing but mere abstraction. Without social relations an individual is merely a biological being.

This methodological key opens the way to understanding the specific historical nature of social justice. Its outlines become apparent in a consideration of the social mechanism which triggers and satisfies human needs. A just social system is one which is directed toward resolving the dynamic problem of satisfying the entire range of existing human needs. Since the needs themselves change and are subject to the effect of the familiar law of their increase, justice is not something static achieved once and for all. The actions and stipulations which applied yesterday may no longer apply today. Furthermore, let us point out that in the dialectical relationship between individual and society the need for justice applies to both sides. What is meant by need is not simply the need of the individual but the collective, the social needs as well.

That is why this problem may be expressed as follows: what could the individual expect of society at a given level of material and spiritual production and a specific status of social relations? What could and should society demand of the individual at a given stage of solution of topical social problems? We can justifiably consider the optimal coincidence between the expectations of the individual and the demands of society as the existing level of justice.

The following examples may be used in order to gain a more tangible understanding of this thesis: during the difficult period of the Patriotic War, when the existence of the very foundations of our system was in question, the demand to defend the Soviet society to the last drop of blood and the appeal for dedication and even self-sacrifice was the only just one. The military exploit of millions of Soviet soldiers confirmed the way this just appeal was accepted by the masses. Now, when the country is urgently facing the task of



accelerating the growth rates of labor productivity and upgrading public production efficiency and work quality, while surmounting objective and subjective difficulties, the appeal to increase the individual labor contribution to the common cause and to consider this social need one of the main individual objectives and to strengthen conscious state, production and labor discipline, is also an unquestionably just appeal.

Addressing the November 1982 Central Committee Plenum, Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, speaking of the need for initiative-minded and creative work and for a truly personal attitude toward the people's good, noted that "naturally, this problem can be resolved only with the participation of every worker, every working person in our enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhoses. We must see to it that they adopt this task as their own."

In these words justice is the voice of social duty. It is directed toward meeting on a priority basis the main, the decisive social needs. In all cases, it is just when superior values--belief in the justice of communist ideals, patriotic thrust and internationalist feelings--prevail over egotistical motivations. This is a manifestation of the social nature of man, his dignity and spiritual nobility.

## II

Marxist philosophy formulated, entered as a basic communist party document and confirmed through historical practice the formula for justice which is the leading socialist principle in defining the fundamental relations between society and the individual. It is well-known to us: "from each according to his capabilities, and to each according to his work." We perfectly understand that, as the first phase of communism, socialism neither does nor can provide full justice. Justice here is limited to what is objectively possible and necessary.

What determines the responsibility of the mature socialist society to each one of its members and individual citizens? Above all, its essential "human centrism," the humanistic nature of its immediate targets and final ideals.

We, our generation of Soviet people, are a link in the chain of social progress. We are answerable to our predecessors, to the history of the country, and the behests of our fathers. Our socialist revolutionary innovations are inseparable from progressive traditions. Historical justice demands that nothing of what generations of fighters for freedom have bequeathed to us remain lost. That on which we rely today was created through the efforts of previous generations. We must safeguard and develop the entire progressive and democratic culture created by history.

We are answerable also to the future generations for whose sake we are laying today a great deal of that which will go far in time during the third millennium. The waste of our resources or failure to advance human culture would mean committing the greatest possible injustice toward our descendants.



All of this is true. At the same time, justice also means that today as well everything possible must be done for our contemporaries, for their self-development and for the enhancement of material well-being and the blossoming of spiritual wealth. Developed socialism can provide this.

The framework of this growth and self-development was given to us as a material and spiritual legacy as well as (particularly worth emphasizing) the result of our current efforts and the existing possibilities we have created ourselves. The material possibilities of society and the nature of existing contradictions which move the production process determine the basic parameters for the implementation of actions which are assessed by our social consciousness and as a manifestation of social justice.

This is determined by the means for labor incentive, the ways of labor progress and the conditions governing rewards or blame at work. This also determines the specific methods of public education and training for labor activity, the specific nature of distribution of manpower resources and the territorial and sectorial deployment of cadres.

The level reached in the production of material goods, the existing and improving system of social relations and the organizational-managerial structure are the basis for decision-making regarding the nature of distribution. The people's implementation of the objective requirement of realizing their possibilities and developing their capabilities in the course of socially useful labor is a necessary prerequisite for distribution consistent with the nature of socialism and based on labor. The 26th CPSU Congress firmly emphasized that "our system of material and moral incentives must ensure always and everywhere a justifiable and objective assessment of individual labor contributions."

The profound content of this thesis contains the answer to one of the most sensitive problems which arise in the consideration of the principle of justice. It is the question of the dialectics of equality and inequality. Passions have clashed and emotions raged frequently on this subject. The ideal of equality has always been attractive to the masses, to those whose life was spent at the social bottom and whose shoulders supported the growing pyramid of wealth, power and prestige. The elitist vision of the world and the aspiration to perpetuate the division of people into "aristocrats" and "plebes," and "uppers" and "lowers" has always been inherent in the ideology and mentality of the exploiters. Today as well their most frank supporters persistently claim that inequality is a necessary prerequisite for freedom. They proclaim that inequality alone can nurture culture and freedom. They assert the eternal and inevitable nature of the social classification of people. Frequently ideas of general unification, positions which the Marxist class described as "equalizing communism," appeared as a direct reaction to such arrogant statements and to the actual suppression of the human dignity of millions of people by the "powerful of this world."

Any manifestation of elitist snobbery is profoundly alien to us. Under socialist conditions no castes standing above the masses and outside the masses are admissible. Nothing in our truly democratic society--neither official

position nor educational level or the importance of social functions performed by an individual--would give grounds for anyone or any social group, community or association to claim exceptional status. In our country all people are equal in the need to perform their social duty and in their constitutional obligations and rights. This is just. However, this equality should not be confused with equalization. Marxism-Leninism resolves the problem of equality as inseparably linked with the historical task of the elimination of class differences and the creation of economic and social conditions under which all people will have equal access to the goods of life and to all realms of constructive activity. For the time being, however, this remains a matter for the future.

Under present-day circumstances it is possible, necessary and just to apply a different criterion in regulating relations between society and the individual--labor. This means giving to each according to his labor and results, in accordance with conditions, intensiveness and quality. This criterion calls for preserving elements of inequality in distribution. We oppose privileges unrelated to labor results. However, we favor giving preferences. V. I. Lenin himself emphasized that "a preference in shock work means preference in consumption" (op. cit., vol 42, p 212). The question of some preferences granted by society to one worker category or another is quite complex and occasionally triggers sharp emotional reactions in mass awareness. It may seem that any sensible person should understand the justice of the fact that a more substantial contribution to our common cause and greater responsibility for its results or work under unusual conditions justifies such preferences. However, it is precisely in this case more than anywhere else that a feeling of measure and scrupulous punctiliousness are necessary.

Our society has a reliable method for a truly democratic correlation among human interests. Thus, the social consumption funds considerably "equalize" the satisfaction of individual requirements. At the same time, through its wage and material incentive systems society establishes differences and the grounds for injustice of still-remaining elements of economic inequality. Salaries, wage rates, bonuses, supplements and additions to wages, benefits and advantages based on labor conditions and degrees of labor success and titles and awards are all social instruments which ensure the just distribution of social wealth.

Unfortunately, hardly everything in this mechanism of ours is smooth. The optimal measure of correlation between the labor contribution of one professional group or another and the goods made accessible to it is frequently violated. The bonus system in material production, which was planned in the past as a means for equitably rewarding the best, frequently becomes a form of faultless equalization and raising wages to the highest possible limit. The orientation of the wage system toward end results quite frequently remains unreachable. Such examples of existing injustice, alas, are still numerous. Our press writes of them constantly. All of this proves that this complex and conflicting mechanism may have breakdowns, disproportions and deviations from the equitable assessment of the work of one group or individual or another, for which reason it needs particular attention and improvement. In this case delays in resolving ripe problems are inadmissible. The

social organism is an extremely complex and dynamic system. The detection and identification of its changes which call for amendments to the specific means through which justice is ensured are quite difficult. However, this must be done on a steady and steadfast basis. In the current complex and conflicting international situation, the ideas and principles of justice assume particular importance not only in relations among people but among nations as well. Securing a durable peace, eliminating the thermonuclear threat and systematically implementing the policy of detente are today the radical prerequisites for the triumph of the spirit of justice.

Such are the objective foundations for the practice of justice under developed socialist conditions.

### III

In order for social justice to be applied in practice in our society to the fullest possible extent today we cannot rely exclusively on its objective foundations or formulate its principles and requirements. The latter must become the actual controlling grounds for individual actions. This, however, is impossible without a purposeful shaping of a feeling of justice and understanding its nature. It is quite dangerous to rely on the spontaneous development of such an understanding and feeling.

The first thing to which we must pay attention is the need for a realistic approach to the problem. More than anywhere else here confusing wishes with possibilities and ideals with reality is inadmissible. Such confusion occasionally triggers excessive aspirations, a feeling of dissatisfaction, a mentality to the effect that people have been "shorted," or feelings about which V. Mayakovskiy himself said that "we are midges who must be fed." The question of recurring demagogic interpretation of justice and splashes of exaggerated aspirations remains quite sensitive. It is only an optimal correlation between public and private interests that can act as the very foundation of justice. This is extremely necessary today and will always remain so. In speaking of people under communism, Lenin emphasized that they will not "demand the impossible."

The word "need" in the description of communist justice should be combined with the adjective "sensible." Sensible means something controlled by reason, consciously assessed, realistic, based on a sober analysis of available possibilities and morally weighed. All of us must be aware of the real situation and not proceed on the basis of prejudiced views or pious wishes. That is precisely why the practice of justice greatly relies today on the purposeful shaping of sensible needs and developing consumption standards. Whims are unpredictable and immeasurable. Society cannot be guided by them.

All such phenomena have their opposite side. The steady growth of material prosperity of the broad masses is our historical gain. However, in some people it creates the illusion of the ease with which all goods can be obtained. It triggers moods of waste and carelessness and dulls concepts of economy and thrift which are so greatly necessary under socialist conditions.



The extensive dissemination of television, motion pictures, radio and the press broadens the outlook of the people and supplies them with abundant information. At the same time, however, occasionally they contain topics which encourage the essentially base feeling of conspicuous consumption, creating mirages of "objectism," and contributing to the promotion of standards alien to our value orientations. This is manifested particularly acutely when models of Western "mass cult," based on philistine standards and heavily tainted with open bourgeois ideology, reach us through one channel or another. Yet where healthy needs are pushed aside and yield to grubby motivations the sense of justice becomes drastically distorted.

To a certain extent the appearance of such situations is also related to a number of objective aspects. The multistage and extremely complex process of contemporary social production is such that the worker does not always acquire a real idea of the consistency between his own contribution and the possibility of society to meet the entire range of human needs. In the past, under a barter economy and small-scale production, labor and the labor product were directly related. It was possible then to see with one's own eyes the volume of the product created by the individual worker and what that same worker could rely on. Under contemporary conditions the connection between the individual contribution to the social purse and the personal share of the volume of goods and services allocated is quite difficult to perceive psychologically. Hence the possibility arises of a distorted assessment in correlating one's individual contribution to the individual consumption fund received from society (a table, a wardrobe, household objects, recreation facilities, and so on). Reliance on the incalculable social wealth and the naive idea that it is a bottomless horn of plenty occasionally trigger excessive appetites. We do not reject pleasures, enjoyments, holidays or banquets. Without them life would lose a great deal of its color. However, the people have long expressed their proper attitude toward this problem in the wise saying that work is long and pleasure is short.

The main thing in life is constructive activity; the main area of self-realization is labor; the pivotal need worthy of man is the need to work. These are basic concepts in understanding the nature of social justice under developed socialism. Today we feel particularly acutely the perspicacity and depth of Lenin's thought of the need under socialism for the strictest possible control over the measure of labor and consumption. The 26th party congress directed us toward the practical advancement of this control system. Wherever such control weakens, those who desecrate our principles and ideals raise their heads. Loafers and black marketeers, wasters of the public good, and cynical violators of our morality act as the tools of disgusting injustice and as sinister shadows of the old world. The justice of socialist awareness calls for putting an end to such ruinous manifestations.

A moral health prevails throughout Soviet society. This is unquestionable. However, a number of features related to the level of moral consciousness continue to create major concern. Particularly intolerable today are cases in which "consciousness" falls behind "knowledge." In recent years moral poverty and primitivism have not been isolated cases. They have left their mark on the concept of justice as well. This cannot fail to concern us.



Obviously, in order to define the way to fight such phenomena we must clearly demarcate the basic and specific target on which public opinion must focus. Generally speaking, our main "opponent" in this area seems to be today the moral fault of lack of principles. It is precisely this negative moral quality, which is spreading and trying to establish itself, that hinders more than the others the struggle against the faults noted at the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses. Lack of principles, which are the opposite of communist principle-mindedness, lead to injustice and total forgiveness. It lowers moral indignation caused by immoral actions, encourages indifference, conciliationism and adaptation to circumstances, and so on.

It would be no error to claim that under current circumstances declaring war on lack of principles means finding the specific link in the chain which would enable us firmly to raise the entire system of shaping the moral aspect of people and defend justice. Unfortunately, in assessing people and, particularly, in resolving cadre problems, it is precisely this feature which is by far not always considered closely.

Another major problem exists as well. More than ever before today everyone must realize more clearly the connection between personal labor contribution and obtained benefits. The educational system could work more intensively on relating the training process more closely to material and spiritual production. Adult infantilism and excessively extended social coming-into-being are intolerable. In the labor collectives as well the problem of interpreting the social significance of labor could be formulated more accurately and tangibly. Everyone must be clearly and substantively aware of the place of his work, brigade, shop, plant, institution and sector in our great social organism.

This is the very foundation for developing a total understanding of the nature of social justice, its components and its current forms of manifestation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## ETHNIC PROCESSES IN THE USSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 56-64

[Article by Academician Yu. Bromley]

[Text] Ethnic characteristics are a feature of national phenomena. This applies to the national specific characteristics which are manifested mainly in daily standards, customs, behavioral norms and mental characteristics, value orientations in particular. Self-awareness is also a mandatory area in which ethnicity is manifested.

When we single out the ethnic aspect of national processes we must always bear in mind its organic connection with socioeconomic factors. In other words, two basic features may be conventionally singled out in national communities and processes: the ethnic and the socioeconomic. Naturally, the socioeconomic base plays a determining role in ethnosocial processes.

Setting ethnic aspects aside enables us to study more profoundly the nature of national processes, above all by studying the cultural features of national life distinguished, as we know, by their greater stability. At the same time, the distinction made between the two sides in national phenomena (the socioeconomic and the ethnic) calls for the special study of their interconnection and interaction. As a whole, under the conditions of building socialism, the social structure of the peoples becomes equalized as the sizes of the basic social groups become similar and as the social development of peoples with a relatively high share of previously unskilled workers is promoted at a higher pace. In this respect the creation of a national working class in all republics was particularly important. Under the Soviet system a national intelligentsia developed in those countries as well. Whereas initially it was mainly a creative, administrative-managerial and mass-profession (physicians, teachers, intelligentsia, in the postwar years we have noted an intensive growth in the production, scientific and, above all, scientific and technical, intelligentsia. Whereas by the end of the 1930s the largest numbers of workers and employees were found among the Russians alone, in 1970 they predominated among all national groups other than the Turkmens and the Moldavians; in 1979 they predominated among all native nationalities of union republics without exception. The strengthening of the social homogeneity of the nations was manifested also in the rapprochement among their educational levels.

Whereas before the war this was manifested above all in the creation of a uniform national class structure, following this creation the task of enriching it by increasing the share of skilled labor and broadening the range of professions consistent with the requirements of the contemporary level reached by scientific and technical progress became increasingly important. The intensiveness of the social changes occurring today can be clearly seen by comparing generations of fathers and children based on recent interrepublic ethnosociological studies. Quite indicative in this respect are data on Estonia. Thus, the generation of "grandfathers" with primary education was in the majority--63 percent in the countryside and 56 percent in town were engaged in unskilled labor. Among the younger generation such labor accounted for only 19 percent in town and 30 percent in the country; their employed children (third generation) are virtually all engaged in skilled labor (unskilled labor in this generation accounts for no more than 2 percent in town and no more than 10 percent in the countryside).

The process of intensification of social homogeneity under developed socialist conditions was clearly expressed in the constitutionally codified fact that the Soviet state is becoming a socialist state of the whole people. The rapprochement among all classes and social groups within Soviet society is continuing in the direction of developing its classless structure in its main and essential features within the historical framework of mature socialism.

Nevertheless, social differences remain, including differences on the territorial level. For example, in 1979, whereas workers in the Kazakh SSR accounted for 68 percent of the entire population, they accounted for 44 percent in the Turkmen SSR. Such differences become even more noticeable if we take into consideration the share of workers of native nationalities in the population of union republics. That is precisely why Comrade Yu. V. Andropov particularly noted in his report "60 Years of USSR" that in some union republics "native nationalities must become more fully represented in the working class."

National characteristics remain very durable in family life in the peoples of our country. Relations, levels of participation of women and junior family members in resolving important family problems and the division of domestic obligations differ. This involves important social problems. An inverse relationship between the size of the family, the number of children and the employment of women in skilled labor jobs has been established. The 1979 population census has shown that the share of employed women is lower in Central Asian republics in which the largest families are found. In the Baltic area, where the number of children per family is minimal, this indicator was higher.

The singling out of the ethnic aspects in contemporary national processes has led in recent years to paying increased attention to their ethnodemographic parameters, particularly the dynamics of the numerical strength of the individual nations. The correlation among the size of the different nations does not remain fixed. This is due mainly to differences in their natural growth rates. Thus, over a 20-year period (between the 1959 and 1979 censuses) the population in the southeastern parts of the country increased by 75-100 percent or more, whereas in other areas population increases ranged between 10

and 25 percent or even less. The peoples in the Central Asian republics, many of whom were on the verge of physical extinction before the revolution, have reached today the highest indicators in the world in natural population growth (3-3.5 percent annually). As a result, the percentage of peoples belonging to the Slavic language group declined from 77.1 percent in 1959 to 72.8 percent in 1979, whereas the share of the Turkic language group increased respectively from 11.1 to 15.2 percent.

Inseparably linked to this are the ethnodemographic aspects of manpower reproduction: manpower surpluses in some areas and shortages in others. In turn, this makes the ethnic aspects of demographic policy particularly relevant. In particular, increased aid paid for a second and third child could be of some importance in increasing the birth rate among peoples in which it is particularly low currently. As was especially pointed out at the 26th congress, "aid for children, particularly for a second and third child will be increased." This idea was codified in subsequent legislation. Naturally, these are merely the initial steps.

The question of the role of national labor traditions has been raised in connection with the study of the ethnic aspects of the problem of manpower resources. Their skillful and flexible consideration could help to improve the location, development and organization of production facilities.

Traditions play an essential role in population migrations, the optimizing of which is also important in terms of regulating the utilization of manpower resources. In this connection, particular attention was paid to the fact that in Central Asia the mobility of the population, including the rural residents, is held back by the traditions of having a large family and strong family relations, i.e., by ethnic factors.

However, population migration is an important factor in changing the ratios in the size of peoples inhabiting various parts of the country. In particular, largely related to this factor is the growing multinational, polyethnic nature of the republics. The scale of this process is quite significant. Thus, in 1979 the number of people not belonging to the native nationalities of union and autonomous republics had already reached 55 million, i.e., more than 20 percent of the entire population. As a result, currently all union republics include members of many non-native nationalities, who have specific requirements in the areas of language, culture and way of life.

We also note a certain unevenness in the growth of multinationality in the republics. Between the 1959 and 1979 census s, the number of Russians living outside the RSFSR increased by 7.6 million. In some republics (southern mainly) their percentage declined in relative and even absolute terms.

Ethnic consolidation, ethnic assimilation and interethnic integration substantially influence ethnic processes.

Ethnic consolidation usually means the merging of several linguistically and culturally related ethnic units, so-called ethnographic (subethnic) groups, most frequently within each existing nation and nationality. The term



ethnic assimilation is applied to processes of the dissolution of individual group (or individual members) of one nation within another. We must distinguish between coercive and natural assimilation. The negative nature of the former is universally acknowledged. To a certain extent, natural assimilation under the conditions of multinational polyethnic countries, in which no barriers have been erected preventing close contacts among nations, is inevitable. Its progressive nature, even under capitalist conditions, was especially noted by V. I. Lenin, who emphasized that "anyone who is not sullied by nationalistic prejudices cannot fail to see in this process of assimilation of nations under capitalism a most important historical progress" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 24, p 127).

Interethnic integration means the appearance of several ethnic groups--peoples sharing common cultural and self-awareness features. Unlike assimilation, this is not accompanied by the absorption of some ethnic groups by others. However, as history proves, interethnic communities precede as a rule the merger among basic ethnic subunits in large geographic areas, thus contributing to the gradual enhancement of the level of their cultural integration.

From the very first days of the Soviet system, the socioeconomic changes which were made created in our country created favorable conditions for the tempestuous development of ethnic consolidation processes. Ethnic groups similar in terms of language and culture united in previously backward outlying areas, turning into large ethnic and national groups. This marked the shaping of a number of Central Asian nations, particularly the Turkmens, who developed on the basis of tribal Yomudy, Tekintsy, Gokleny and others groups. A number of ethnic groups were developed in Siberia as a result of consolidation processes, including the Altays, consisting of the Altay-Kizhi, Telengity, Teleuty and other small tribes and nationalities.

Under the Soviet system many already old nations became more monolithic. Whereas in the first period following the October Revolution Pomory, Kerzhaki and some Cossack and Kamchadaly groups sometimes did not even consider themselves as belonging to the Russian people, as most of them were different in terms of dialect, culture and way of life, today it would be difficult to single them out as ethnic groups within the Russian people. The Setu ethnographic group is gradually blending with the other Estonians; the Latgal'tsy are blending with the Letts and differences among ethnographic groups of the Belorussian, Georgian, Uzbek and other peoples are disappearing rapidly. The consolidation process is manifested in the gradual narrowing of the field of action of territorial dialects and the dissemination of a literary language in ordinary speech.

Ethnic varieties in our country have decreased considerably under the Soviet system. This has been reflected, in particular, in the reduction of ethnonyms from 194 in 1926 to 101 in 1979.

Let us also emphasize that the time of the highest activeness of interethnic consolidation processes has already passed. It is indicative that the list of ethnonyms listed in the 1979 census is virtually the same as in the 1979

census. In many nations ethnic consolidation is continuing but not as intensively as before.

In our time changes are taking place in the territorial consolidation of nations, caused essentially by migrations. Between 1926 and 1979 the compactness of the population declined most strongly among the Russians: 95.2 percent of the entire Russian population in the country lived in the RSFSR in 1926 and only 82.6 percent in 1979. This was due to the migration of the Russian population to the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and other republics in the country. The density of the Belorussian and Georgian population decreased somewhat; however, among the peoples of union republics by 1979 they had retained their highest density; no more than some 4 percent of all Georgians lived outside Georgia (1.8 percent in 1926). Since 1926 the population density of the Ukrainians, Moldavians, Letts and Azerbaijanis gradually increased until 1970, after which it showed a certain decrease. Population density among the Armenians, Lithuanians and Estonians increased steadily. However, among the peoples of union republics Armenians still showed the lowest population density. Among peoples with autonomous republics the territorial density of the Bashkirs and Tatars showed the greatest decline compared with 1926.

Some changes in the country's ethnic structure are also the result of assimilation processes. Such processes take place among all multinational poly-ethnic countries in the world. A distinguishing feature of these kinds of processes in the USSR is their natural character. This is clearly confirmed by the fact that they are mostly the result of interethnic marriages, the offspring of which usually choose the ethnic affiliation of one of the parents, thus terminating the ethnic line of the other. The development of friendly interethnic relations under the Soviet system and the elimination of religious barriers resulted, along with an increase in territorial ethnic mixing, in a considerable increase in the number of such marriages. Whereas in 1925 only one out of 40 marriages were ethnically mixed, there were one out of 10 at the end of the '50s and in a number of cities even one out of three to four (particularly frequent are ethnically mixed marriages in Moldavian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Latvian and other cities). The percentage of families of different ethnic origins is continuing to increase. Whereas according to the 1959 census such families accounted for 10.2 percent of the overall number of families in the country, by 1970 their number had increased to 13.5 percent. In 1979 such families accounted for nearly 15 percent. The highest percentage of nationally mixed families is found in the Latvian, Kazakh and Ukrainian union republics (20-21 percent in 1970 as compared to 14-16 percent in 1959).

The ethnic consequences of nationally mixed families largely determine the trend of assimilation processes. Substantial regional differences exist in establishing one's ethnic affiliation on the part of adolescents raised in mixed families. Thus, in the Baltic areas, in families in which one of the spouses belongs to the native population (Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian), while the other is Russian, approximately one-half of the adolescents opt to be Russian while the other half choose the local nationality. Meanwhile, in Chuvashiya, the predominant part of adolescents raised in Chuvash-Russian

families consider themselves Russian. A different situation prevails in Turkmenia. Here most offspring of Turkmen-Russian families declare themselves Turkmen. To a certain extent, this is related to the fact that with the Turkmen, ethnic affiliation is traditionally determined by the father, and here in virtually all mixed families the father is Turkmen. Furthermore, the socialization of the adolescents takes place in an environment in which Turkmen predominate. All in all, it is obvious that the ethnic structure of the environment in which the adolescent becomes socialized is of decisive importance in terms of ethnic self-affiliation.

In addition to assimilation related to nationally mixed marriages, ethnic affiliations may change also as a result of "extra-family" interaction with members of different ethnic groups. True, such "extra-family" assimilation which, of course, is equally natural, took place mainly during the prewar years and essentially among ethnically transitional population groups (mainly at the "juncture" of related nations). Particularly noteworthy in this respect is the fact that in 1939 there were approximately one-third fewer Ukrainians living outside the Ukraine than in 1926. The reduced pace of "extra-family" ethnic assimilation on the eve of the war is largely determined, in particular, by the fact that at the end of the 1930s the choice of nationality was limited to the nationality of the parents.

Let us particularly emphasize in looking at ethnic assimilation as a whole that in the USSR, although having a relatively noticeable influence on the numerical strength of territorially scattered peoples (Jews, Mordovians, Karelians, and others), as a whole it extends to a relatively insignificant share of the country's population.

The main line followed in the ethnic interaction among the peoples of the USSR is not assimilation but interethnic integration, which is manifested above all in the rapprochement among their cultures and the creation of a cultural stratum of unified content but varied in form as well as unified features of the way of life. Such processes are based on the socioeconomic and ideological-political comity of nations and nationalities, Marxist-Leninist ideology and the international unification of the working people around the CPSU.

The international unity of the people was manifested particularly strongly in the universal patriotic upsurge during the Great Patriotic War. The Soviet multinational people, who unanimously rose to the defense of their fatherland and the new social system, expressed their loyalty to their socialist homeland through their heroic exploits at the front and selfless toil in the rear.

International and interethnic integration is most closely related to the process of the appearance and development of the new historical community--the Soviet people. The rapprochement among nations in the economic, social and political-ideological areas, which is the base of the establishment of this international community, paralleled their rapprochement in the ethnocultural area, which is the core of interethnic integration. The trend of rapprochement is dialectically combined with that of the development of national



cultures. It is true that such trends may appear in quite different ways in the various components of culture.

The integration processes are particularly specific in terms of material culture. The clearest manifestation of such changes is found in the withdrawal from archaic and primitive elements of material culture which were widespread before the October Revolution. Obsolete objects of traditional material culture are being replaced by contemporary industrial goods. The Soviet-wide "urban" types of material culture, which reflect the increased requirements of the Soviet people, are becoming increasingly widespread in the course of urbanization. At the same time, some traditional elements of culture, developed by one or several nations in a specific geographic area are becoming widespread throughout the entire Soviet Union (such as Central Asian rugs, Ukrainian male shirts, Baltic metal and amber decorative objects, some Caucasian, Ukrainian or Russian dishes, and so on).

As to ethnic specifics, they will endure far longer inside the home than in terms of the building, in clothing decorations rather than clothing itself, and will be most durable in food. Such features are more clearly manifested not in the utilitarian characteristics of objects but in their esthetic shape. The connection between materialized culture and ethnic self-awareness is exceptionally important. Sometimes self-awareness ascribes ethnic significance to objects of material culture, which did not possess such significance in the past or else had it to a very limited extent (i.e., their ethnic originality was not realized clearly). Quite indicative in this respect is the development of art industries under the Soviet system. The items produced by such industries retain as a rule their ethnic specifics, related to traditions of artistic skill which are passed on and which have developed within the respective ethnic group. Occasionally such items (Russian *matreshki* [wooden dolls], for example) also turn into ethnic symbols, less within the ethnic community, it is true, than in the eyes of members of ethnic groups. However, by becoming part of the daily life of other peoples they contribute to their homogeneization. As a result, the modern family of any nationality (particularly the urban) will look at television or listen to radio broadcasts from other republics or read books translated from another language and interiors in their homes and apartments would display Ukrainian or Baltic ceramics, Georgian engravings, Uzbek or Turkmen rugs, Russian embroidery, and so on. Such objects may be utilitarian or simply decorative.

As a whole, today the disappearance or scarcity of some elements in folk art (essentially related to religion) are combined with the renaissance of a number of traditions which had become extinct or were found only in one ethnic group or another. In this respect the creative reworking of traditional components of folk culture and its reappearance in "secondary" forms play a tremendous role.

Under contemporary conditions as well, when interest in a more international type of music is growing, in their leisure time or during holidays the people turn with increasing pleasure to folk songs and music. We note a comprehensively increased interest in a great variety of folk art. Many of them seem to be experiencing a rebirth.



The national characteristics of the artistic culture of the peoples of the USSR, however, is not reduced to the legacy of the past and to folk art but is largely the result of new, professional creative work. The fact that literature and the arts were made available to the broad masses under the Soviet system brought about an unparalleled increase in the volume of artistic cultures of the individual ethnic groups. As a result, an increase in the general stock of works of art and an expanded scale of consumption of works of art and a broadened range of spiritual demands by the working people have taken place among all the peoples of the USSR. Let us emphasize here that the dissemination of professional artistic culture among the peoples of our country could have been achieved only thanks to giving priority to its development in national forms. We must also take into consideration that workers in professional culture within each ethnic community shape to one extent or another the new features of the original aspects of this culture and contribute to the appearance of new specific traditions within it. Despite active international exchanges, many cultural components, as they acquire an international nature, do not lose their national forms or else become more or less expressive national variants. However, it is precisely in the professional forms of culture that interpenetration among nations is, as a whole, most active and of major importance in the further development of the artistic culture of the peoples of the USSR. It is particularly important to bear this in mind, for professional culture plays the main role in the overall cultural background of the Soviet people.

Integration processes are clearly traced in the use of the leisure time as well. Recent data confirm, in particular, that an approximately similar range of people among the Estonians, the Russians, the Georgians, the Moldavians and the Uzbeks use their leisure time to read newspapers (ranging from 70 to 90 percent in the various social groups); an almost equal amount of time is spent by the people of different nationalities in listening to radio or viewing television.

Ethnolinguistic changes are one of the important aspects of contemporary ethnic processes in our country. Along with the broadened function of national languages, bilingualism, in which the main language for international communication is most frequently Russian, is a characteristic feature of such changes. Thus, between 1970 and 1979 the share of people who speak Russian fluently increased from 76 to 82 percent of the country's population. This general trend, however, as the latest censuses have indicated, has specific national characteristics. Between 1970 and 1979 the percentage of people fluent in Russian as a second language increased substantially in some nations (from 36.1 to 47.4 percent in the Moldavians, and from 35.9 to 52.1 percent in the Lithuanians); in other nations it increased insignificantly (among the Georgians, for example, from 21.3 to 26.7 percent). According to the 1979 census more than 60 percent of the non-Russian population in the country is fluent in Russian. However, this also means that approximately 40 percent of the population is still not fluent in it. We must point out that in a number of cases there has been a lagging in the number of people trained in the Russian language compared with the overall number of students. It has been noted that the young people in some republics speak Russian worse than those of middle age. Yet in many national areas the pace of the flow of

manpower into industry and the performance of active production roles are related to a certain extent to the exposure of the rural population to urban culture and the knowledge of Russian.

Along with Russian, other languages of the peoples of the USSR are widespread as second languages. This substantially helps to develop relations among nations in many union and autonomous republics. In 1979 fluency in such languages was reported by 12.3 million people, or 4.7 percent of the country's population (6.2 million in 1970); the most widespread among them are Ukrainian, Belorussian, Uzbek, Tatar, Moldavian, Azerbaijani, Tajiki, Georgian and others. Let us also bear in mind that the extensive dissemination of languages of international communication is combined in our country with a stable preservation of the concept of the language of one's nationality as native. Under the Soviet system this indicator has remained virtually stable: it was 94.2 percent in 1926 and 93.1 percent in 1979.

As we know, the dissemination of internationalist forms of relations is of the greatest importance in the development of contemporary interethnic processes. Let us note in this connection that the growth of national self-awareness characteristic of today is combined in the Soviet people with the development of positive concepts related to contacts among nations (work in nationally mixed collectives, nationally mixed marriages, and so on). At the same time, ethnosociological studies have determined that a multinational structure of collectives yields positive results wherever experience in maintaining favorable long-term contacts has been acquired. However, in order to achieve this result in young multinational collectives and areas, including cities in which there is an active influx of people from different nationalities, particular efforts must be made, extensive explanatory work must be conducted and a responsive cadre policy must be pursued. Particular concern must be shown for meeting the cultural needs of the people of all nationalities.

In noting the growing trend toward interethnic integration, we must not ignore the task of surmounting elements of national exclusivity, which are still found in some people. It is important to bear in mind that the more differentiated the methods of struggle against this phenomenon are the more successful they will be, for sources of national exclusivity are found among different population strata.

In the light of all this, the study of views, concepts and activities related to contacts among nations and among peoples of different socioprofessional groups, under urban and rural conditions, in areas with different historical and cultural pasts and in different social situations become particularly important. Such studies enable us to determine the social, historical, ethnodemographic and cultural circumstances which help to strengthen friendly contacts.

Educational work aimed at molding and strengthening an internationalist outlook among the broad toiling masses remains a most important task. This helps to develop a more accurate view on the correlation between the national and the international, in the course of which national exclusivity yields to concepts on the progressive nature of rapprochement among nations.

The processes of interethnic integration have been reflected in social consciousness. The feeling of love for one's people and ethnic territory are combined in the Soviet people, as we know, with a growing and a broader feeling of belonging to the Soviet people: Soviet patriotism, based on internationalism and the ideas of equality and unbreakable unity among the peoples of our country.

In a word, interethnic integration is the most important component in the increasingly growing unification among the peoples of our country and the further progress on the part of our society on the long way to the merger among nations predicted by Lenin. At the same time, we must bear in mind that national differences, as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasizes, "will remain for a long time and far longer than class differences." Nevertheless, already under mature socialist conditions the nations will have an essentially classless social structure. Such nations, while largely retaining their ethnocultural specifics, will be less ethnosocial than strictly ethnic communities. Correspondingly, their interethnic integration will be of increasing importance in terms of the future merger among nations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## LATEST TASKS OF SOVIET GEOGRAPHY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 65-75

[Article by N. Agafonov, V. Anuchin and S. Lavrov, doctors of geographic sciences]

[Text] No country in the world has ever had to deal with such complex and truly tremendous sets of territorial problems as ours. Not only the complexity and scale but the contrasts in territorial differences characteristic of the Soviet Union and the unusual variety of economic and social development conditions make clear the need for the adoption of geographic approaches to their study which is secured by the firm social status enjoyed by geographic science.

K. Marx and F. Engels laid the theoretical foundations of economic geography, and V. I. Lenin is justifiably considered the founder of the methodology of economic geography. Let us recall that at the very dawn of the Soviet system, he recommended in his "Supplements to the Draft Sovnarkom Decree on a Mandatory Scientific Minimum in VUZs" that the following be included in it: a plan for electrification, its economic foundations, the economic geography of Russia and the significance of and conditions for the implementation of the plan (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 42, p 427). The creation of economic geography began under the direct influence of Lenin's ideas and the specific help which Lenin provided. It is indicative that today even bourgeois scientists, who have little to do with Marxism, cannot fail to acknowledge the global significance of these ideas. Thus, Preston James, the noted American geographer, has a separate section in his book on the development of world geography through Lenin's ideas (Preston E. James and Geoffrey J. Martin. "All Possible Worlds. A History of Geographical Ideas." Indianapolis, 1981). Soviet geography, with its reliable methodological foundation, closely related to the practical needs of the country, has achieved definite successes in becoming a science which is making a substantial contribution to the building of communism.

Geographers actively participated in substantiating the projects for Dneproges, the Ural-Kuznetsk Combine, the study of the Arctic, and, subsequently, the Antarctic, the comprehensive study of the BAM Zone, the development of mountainous and desert areas of the country, the involvement in economic circulation of huge natural resources, and any specific project related to territorial planning. During the first five-year plans concepts were formulated, which have withstood the test of time, related to the works



of G. M. Krzhizhanovskiy, N. N. Baranskiy, N. N. Kolosovskiy and V. M. Chetyrkin. Landscape studies--a constructive direction in physical geography --developed by Academicians L. S. Berg and S. V. Kalesnik, have earned a wide recognition. N. N. Baranskiy, one of the greatest Soviet economic geographers, laid the foundations of economic zoning, while his fellow worker N. N. Kolosovskiy developed the concept of territorial-production complexes.

This concept was published by N. N. Kolosovskiy in 1947. It gained recognition rapidly and was developed further. Many geographers in various cities and part of the country conducted their studies within its channel. Students in the geography departments of universities made a substantial contribution through their systematic research expeditions including some of economic-geographical nature. Currently the concept of territorial-production complexes has become firmly a part of the theoretical foundations of the long-term economic strategy of the CPSU.

We do not intend in the least to depict the development of Soviet geographic science as a smooth process which followed an ascending line only. The science experienced some declines and periods of substantial lowering of its efficiency. This had a particular impact on general geography studies. This situation had its objective origins and subjective reasons. The former had to do with the position of geography as an interdisciplinary field of knowledge in which natural and social sciences become closely interwoven, in the course of which both act as different sides of a single science. This double nature is the result of the double nature of geographic science itself. Our party press noted that the objective need had developed to consider the contemporary production process as a complex ecological-economic system without pitting the economic against the natural system.

The earth sciences are entering a new stage of development. Features inherent in the precise sciences are being increasingly used in them, such as instrument observations (including from outer space), computers and modeling. The use of advanced methods in the study of the material world, based, in particular, on the application of the systemic approach, is increasing substantially. All of this, in turn, enhances the integrative development trend within the system of geographic sciences as in geography at large and its interaction with related nongeographic sciences, particularly geology and biology in the natural sciences, and economics and sociology, in social studies.

The ubiquitous need for consideration and long-term forecast and of the various (immediate and more distant) consequences of measures carried out by society urgently call for comprehensive geographic expertise. Obviously, this requires proper specialists in territorial planning and managing economic and social development with an understanding of the foundations of the comprehensive geographic approach to the solution of territorial problems. We can only be surprised, therefore, that there still exist some economic VUZs whose leadership continues to display a lack of understanding of the importance of economic geography and is underestimating its role in cadre training. The article by A. Lavrishchev "On the Subject of USSR Economic Geography and Its Contemporary Tasks" (KOMMUNIST, No 15, 1979) drew

the attention to the unfavorable situation in teaching economic geography in VUZs. Despite the recommendation issued by the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education on the need to increase the number of courses on economic geography (in 1977), as a rule, they remain on the "miniature" level and ignore the hugeness and variety of our country. This hinders proper training in the area of territorial problems. Furthermore, here and there there are no chairs of economic geography (or else they are being closed down). To this day there is no such department at the AUCCTU Higher School of the Trade Union Movement, although one would think such a department particularly necessary, for it trains cadres for trade union organs including those who deal in tourism. It is hardly necessary to prove that personnel in such activities in which the science of the earth (knowledge of the country in particular) is a necessary foundation need adequate geographic knowledge.

Finally, we must point out something which, in our view, is abnormal: for a long time geography was represented in the USSR Academy of Sciences by a single academician, a specialist in soil geography, while for nearly 20 years economic geography was not represented at all. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of geography departments in the country's universities mostly graduate geography teachers, although, as a rule, they could train cadres for the national economy as well. Nor have the universities developed so far a uniform system for ecological-geographic training.

Some difficulties have been created by the geographers themselves, who frequently go into strictly specialized research and thus lose track of the general target and tasks of the entire set of geographic sciences. Differentiation without proper integration has begun to cause practical scientific research in geography increasingly tangible harm. Some specialists no longer understand the scientific language of related disciplines and can no longer see the common target. This kind of division represents the past. Today we need comprehensive approaches, combined studies and a broader scientific outlook.

We realize that specialization within any given science is an objectively determined fact. However, excessive specialization in geography conflicts with the logic of the development of scientific knowledge and hinders its equally necessary integration trend. Geography is a basic science which developed as an answer to man's need to master his environment. No purposeful interaction between society and nature is possible without it. From the very beginning it studied not only the variety of conditions which nature offered man but also differences within mankind and its activities. Therefore, geography has always been a science which studies objects and phenomena not only in nature as such but as a result of the interaction between nature and human society at different development stages, a science which studies subjects "on the borderline between society and nature."

The differentiation within it led to the development of two groups of branches: the natural, which studies phenomena and objects which develop on earth under the determining influence of the laws of nature; and the social, which studies phenomena and objects which develop on earth under the influence of specific social laws. These two groups, however, are not separated

from each other by an insurmountable wall but are a single science--geography --which studies the environment of social development and its components of both natural and social origin. "In the final account, nature and history are two structural components of our habitat in which we live, move and manifest ourselves" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 39, p 56).

One of the most important characteristics in the current development of geography is its direct connection to the solution of economic problems. The insufficiency of geographic studies in resolving major problems in economic planning and management is being increasingly felt. "The problem of non-coordination in the development of raw material and processing sectors is still facing us," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov emphasized at the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. In this case geography has failed to assert itself as yet. Many shortcomings in national economic planning, and even more so in preplanned forecasting, have been the result of underestimating geographic differences among the individual areas of our huge and varied country. Although the fact that the territorial-production complex is based in its development, above all on nature, in terms of the components of the environment, seems to be a universal truth, it has not always been properly taken into consideration in planning practices. Insufficient attention has been paid to the data of social and economic geography, historically developed national characteristics, labor habits and the traditions of populations in specific territories, which is particularly important in developing new areas in the East. "The most sensible utilization of natural and manpower resources, the climatic characteristics of each republic and the most efficient inclusion of this potential within the potential of the entire union is what will yield the highest benefits to the individual areas, nations and nationalities and the state at large," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov said at the ceremony on the occasion of the founding of the 60th anniversary of the USSR.

However, the sensible utilization of nature under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution is hindered by a certain disproportion in the development of the various branches of science. This is particularly manifested in the lagging of geography behind the technical sciences, which affects the practical utilization of natural conditions and resources. This situation is characteristic today of world science as well. Although powerful means for influencing nature exist, mankind interferes in natural processes without an awareness of all possible consequences of such interference. The level of comprehensive studies of the geographic environment remains behind the requirements of social practice, which cannot fail to concern us bearing in mind the continuing development of technical facilities through which society influences nature. This is related to disproportions in the development of science: the sectors which provide the "muscle" are outstripping sectors which shape the "intellect"...

Let us mention another current difficulty: frequently geographic works which include a profound economic study and clear practical recommendations are proclaimed "nongeographic" and left without proper certification. In a period of intensified integration processes within Soviet science, the establishment of such rigid boundaries separating geography from economic sociology can only be damaging.



As any other science, geography has its own internal organizational difficulties. They are largely related to the fact that the leading institution--the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Geography, whose purpose is to coordinate the broad front of geographic research on a national scale, has not been performing this function for quite some time.

Although we applaud the fact that in a number of union republics new geographic academic institutes are being opened, we are concerned by the lack of higher qualification cadres in some of them. Obviously, we need a purposeful interdepartmental (academic and VUZ) system for training such geographers. Here as well, however, difficulties exist. We know that the number of "unplanned" requests for young geography specialists submitted by various organizations considerably exceed the number of requests submitted by the education and culture department of the USSR Gosplan. This means that the planned training of geographers takes place without proper consideration of the real requirements on the part of the national economy, which considerably outstrip the plan norms.

The major ways in the development of Soviet science are based on the characteristics of the 1980s and the main task of the 11th Five-Year Plan. Currently a number of factors are complicating economic progress: the reduced increase in manpower resources, increased outlays related to the development of the eastern and northern parts of the country and the inevitable increase in environmental protection expenditures. The November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum called for accelerating the pace of economic development and increasing the absolute volumes of the growth of the national income, industrial and agricultural output and the volume of retail trade. The work on upgrading national economic efficiency will be continued. The stressed assignments must be carried out with a relatively smaller increase in material outlays and manpower resources. The 11th Five-Year Plan is focused on the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the conversion of the economy to more intensive development. This means, above all, a more efficient utilization of the geographic environment. The rationalization of manpower resources, not to mention that of the utilization of nature, would be impossible without taking the geographic factor into consideration.

Whereas modern science as a whole is increasingly specializing not only in terms of sectors but specific problems, its very base makes geography a comprehensive problem science. Here again we must not forget that all attempts to resolve problems related to the location of production forces without taking geography into consideration have never brought anything good. "It is necessary," as Comrade Yu. V. Andropov pointed out, "to continue to improve the location of production forces, regional specialization and cooperation and economic ties and transportation systems."

The problematic nature of geography as a basic science was emphasized at the Seventh Congress of the USSR Geographic Society (Frunze, 1980). The most important comprehensive interdisciplinary problems which were listed included optimizing the socialist utilization of nature, the study and mastery of the world's oceans, the development of aerospace and cartographic methods for the study of the earth's surface, the formation of national economic complexes



and distribution systems, and so on. A most complex problem--the comprehensive development of the East and the North--is also one of the most topical.

Reciprocal exchange of ideas and methods, the "coupling" of the conceptual apparatus, which intensify the cognitive opportunities of geography and related sciences, is a major positive feature in the shaping of interdisciplinary directions. Thus, geographers actively participate in the elaboration of important aspects of the country's demographic policy, including that of the "uniform settlement system." Essentially, this means that population settlements must be based increasingly on the location of production facilities and be related to economic zoning and be consistent with the CPSU's social policy. The experience of the Lithuanian SSR in lowering population "pressure" on the republic's capital while developing local centers and improving services to the rural population, is noteworthy.

A number of specific studies in which geographers actively participated and respective recommendations made it possible to energize the socioeconomic development of a number of small and medium-sized cities, thus contributing to the implementation of the party's course of restraining the growth of a number of large cities. Population migration is a characteristic phenomenon today. Together with economists and sociologists, geographers are successfully studying migration flows and the settling of manpower in labor-short areas, particularly in the North. Manpower shortages will develop in many parts of our country during the 11th Five-Year Plan and in the more distant future, for which reason the study of specific demographic circumstances exclusive to the individual areas becomes increasingly topical.

The 26th CPSU Congress set the task of equalizing social differences on the territorial level in our country. This calls for a more profound study of social indicators and levels and standards of life in remote areas. In our science, the initial steps in this direction were geographic studies of services and ways of life and tourism, in which social and economic factors inseparably blend. Any lagging in the social infrastructure harms the economy.

An integral direction has become a universally acknowledged trend in the development of Soviet geography. This is particularly noticeable in synthesizing the results of geographic and economic studies. Good examples already exist of specific practical science and preplanning geographic work. Thus, in many areas with difficult natural conditions for construction evaluation charts and similar recommendations have been drafted, which make it possible to consider not only the specifics of the territory but the characteristics of each type of its systems (transportation, energy, reclamation, and so on). The concept of resource availability, formulated by geographers for a number of areas enables us to make a thorough study of existing production structures and to optimize territorial-production complexes. The various "resource" charts, which reflect not only the scale of natural resources but their quality, territorial combination and development conditions are an inseparable element of such studies. What is regrettable is that not every practical worker is aware of the existence of such projects and is able to use them. Geographic branches such as land hydrology and landscape studies

are becoming increasingly involved in the solution of most important problems of land reclamation and improved fertility, agroreclamation zoning, farmland assessments, forestry development projects, and others. By becoming scientific departments which ensure the growth of the effectiveness of agriculture and forestry, they help to optimize the overall utilization of nature.

We know that the law of zonal developments is universal: there is no landscape, including the anthropogenic, which is not affected by it. This is a most important geographic law and, consequently, a law affecting the geographic environment, which must be taken into consideration in any measure related to the natural environment such as, for example, in the implementation of the Food Program. Thus, the expanded utilization of the land in the Nonchernozem Zone must be paralleled by a thorough consideration of zonal differences covering this tremendous territory and including a number of specific zonal formations which, if ignored in the practical utilization of nature, would be a major risk. We must clearly realize that the Nonchernozem consists of several zones and not a simple "zone," and that it cannot develop normally if the same type of economic measures are applied to it. On this level again it is very important to note as a positive phenomenon the fact that rayons, krays and autonomous republics are creating their own agroindustrial associations, which are the most important organizational prerequisite for the elimination of stereotypes in the use of nature and in taking intrazonal differences in major areas into consideration. This also enhances the role of local economic-geographic studies and increases the importance of public organizations, the trade unions in particular, in the administration of the agroindustrial complex. The specific nature of trade union work in the countryside is organically linked with strengthening the importance of local, natural and economic conditions in the implementation of the Food Program.

In a number of cases the consideration of local geographic conditions is ascribed a decisive importance in the Food Program, for it is their variety which determines the specific nature of the various steps to be taken on the territory of our huge country. A differentiated approach is considered in defining the planned assignments of kolkhozes and sovkhoses based on their location. This will contribute to the equalization of their economic possibilities. Agricultural geographers have charted special maps and characteristics on individual agricultural production conditions. The country's territory has been subdivided into zones and agricultural areas based on specific conditions predetermining their agricultural specialization.

The geographic approach ensures a more intensive utilization of the land and productive capital. It eliminates stereotype in land utilization. In turn, this ensures increased crop yields and overall labor productivity. The science of geography is most directly related to the implementation of the decisions of the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum and is actively contributing to the implementation of the Food Program and the development of our country's agroindustrial complex.

Cities and industrial and transport territories are occupying an increasing share of the land, reaching 5 to 6 percent in some areas (the Baltic republics and the Ukraine), and 16 percent in Moscow Oblast. Naturally, the

economic-geographical aspects of urbanization deserve great attention. The design institutes of the USSR Gosstroy and the gosstroys of union republics have employed for quite some time geographers specializing in various fields, although in their tables organization they are still listed as economists, engineers or anything else.

It is important to note that the Food Program was created on the basis of the utilization of the principles of comprehensiveness and the territorial approach. It considers agriculture as combined with servicing industrial sectors, transportation and trade, and subordinates their activities to a single end target--the production of high-quality foodstuffs and their delivery to the consumer. The agroindustrial complex is singled out as a separate autonomous planning and management target. This enables us to combine more efficiently territorial (geographic!), sectorial and target-program planning. The implementation of the Food Program calls for the adoption of a number of measures in each union republic strictly on the basis of the specific characteristics of its geographic environment. It would be difficult to imagine any large-scale project such as the interbasin reallocation of water resources without thorough geographic work and reliable prediction of consequences, which always have a socioeconomic manifestation.

The next direction in the development of the geographic science is strengthening its role in resolving ecological problems, which have never been alien to geography.

Some geographers describe this "expanded" ecology as "global ecology," while others consider it "social ecology." The latter description seems most adequate to us, as it indicates an interdisciplinary combination of sciences. It is symptomatic that one of the greatest ecologists in our country, Academician S. Shvarts, has arrived to the following strictly geographic tasks, starting from biology: the description of ecological-economic features of large sections of the earth and the formulation of an ideal system for the development of a biogeocenotic cover for a unified economic-geographic area (see S. Shvarts, "Problems of Human Ecology" in the collection "Novyye Idei v Geografii" [New Ideas in Geography], No 4, Progress, Moscow, 1979, pp 38-39).

Bearing in mind the contemporary scale of anthropogenic influence on the environment, purely technical or sectorial (departmental) solutions of ecological problems are in many cases totally insufficient, for each area has its own specific natural background and "node" of such problems. This insufficiency became particularly obvious in the course of the practical elaboration of the respective sections of regional plans for comprehensive economic and social development.

All of these trends lead to the fact that geographic science is becoming a "synthesizing" area of knowledge in the study of nature and society. Naturally, a number of difficulties exist here such as its coordination with other interdisciplinary sets of sciences, coordination of the conceptual apparatus, defining subject differences and method stipulations, and others.



Integration implies the need for a comprehensive approach traditional in geography and currently increasingly necessary in resolving not only major economic problems on a national scale but a number of regional and local problems as well. The significance of the comprehensive approach becomes particularly clear in the example of the extensive development of the new areas in the eastern and northern parts of our country, which account for more than half of the entire Soviet territory, including the BAM program and, within it, the organization of several new territorial-production complexes. Underpopulated areas with a still insufficiently developed or totally lacking technical-economic and social infrastructure are being redeveloped (in some areas the development is not even new but "pioneering," i.e., initial). Most of the territory on which such development is taking place is characterized by hard or even extreme natural conditions: a lengthy low-temperature period, polar nights, forests, very rugged topography, permafrost, swampiness and other adverse characteristics appearing in various combinations in the different areas, hindering and increasing the cost of new development. In the final account, new, "pioneer" in particular, development requires tremendous additional outlays. For example, in the northern part of the Ob River, the cost of building automotive roads is higher compared to Central Siberia by a factor of 5-6 or even higher. An approximately similar disparity exists in the cost of housing construction and slightly less in equipping work places.

In each new development area the specific cost-increase factors may vary in terms of importance but all of them increase development capital intensive-ness. Bearing in mind the growing scale of this process in the country, lowering the impact of cost-increasing factors is a problem of national importance, the solution of which demands a knowledge and utilization of the geographic specifics of each developed area, which requires major geographic research. Although a number of examples to this effect could be cited, let us mention here but a few.

For example, the efficiency with which new areas are developed is related to the achievements of scientific and technical progress. This is universally known. However, which precisely among them would be most expedient under one set of circumstances or another? We could confidently say that in this case stereotype is inadmissible. Thus, the production of various types of equipment for special use must be based on specific geographic conditions, such as climate, topography, hydrological systems, and so on. A considerable percentage of the transportation equipment which can be successfully used in Eastern Siberia and the Far East is far less efficient in the West Siberian Depression. The tremendous scale and specific features of the development of petroleum and gas resources in the Tyumen North make expedient the use of essentially new systems for transportation development in this area, involving the use not only of conventional but the latest types of transportation, such as freight airships as well as freight, freight-passenger and passenger hovercraft. Technologically, this solution is entirely realistic. However, economic and organizational practical problems arise.

Frequently the economic efficiency of new developments is lowered by the high manpower turnover and the low percentage of settled cadres. So far essentially economic levers have been used to stabilize the population and manpower resources in new development areas (wage supplements, increased



pension benefits, and so on). However, this hardly covers all opportunities for retaining the population and manpower resources. Medical-geographic and demographic studies have proved, among others, that settlers from various parts of the country show different possibilities of adaptation to very special (extreme in particular) natural conditions, which must be taken into consideration in practical work. Something else is even more important. Characteristic in some newly developed territories are conditions which are unsuitable for permanent settlements from the medical-biological viewpoint. In this connection, a shift development method is being applied in the North. Unquestionably, it is progressive and, if properly implemented, promises to yield significant economic results. On the other hand, housing construction in the Central Asian republics has not always taken properly into consideration their geographic characteristics. Thus, construction in Nurek is based on unionwide standards, regardless of the climate.

These are merely a few cases proving the need to take the geographic features of newly developed areas under consideration. They could also include the territorial specifics of housing construction and engineering systems, the various types of permafrost influence, the complexity of hydraulic reclamation and biogeographic problems, and others. Other equally complex problems requiring nonstereotype solutions face already long-developed areas. Agricultural concentration and specialization and agroindustrial integration are general economic processes, but the territorial conditions under which they take place are quite dissimilar. Therefore, the system and sequence of measures related to agricultural production development and intensification cannot be the same not only in Moldavia or the Kuban, on the one hand, or the Nonchernozem Zone in the RSFSR, on the other, but within the Nonchernozem area itself. However, let us emphasize that here the more important differences lie not in actual (although mandatorily considered) but in socioeconomic conditions. The economic efficiency of agricultural production is influenced by factors such as the accessibility of farmland and the location of the kolkhoz and sovkhoz central farmsteads in terms of roads and rayon centers, the greater or lesser dispersion of rural settlements, the size and age-sex structure of the manpower in settlements, and so on. Substantial differences may exist among such characteristics.

A high percentage of older workers has developed in some Nonchernozem farms, which should not be ignored. Workers belonging to the senior generation are people with practical experience, labor skills and attachment for farmwork and the rural way of life. However, we should not ignore the fact that the labor experience and skills of the senior generation developed 30 to 40 years ago, at a time when there was far less available equipment and production standards were different. Therefore, detailed economic-geographic studies on the level of the administrative rayons and farms would be relevant from the practical viewpoint.

Comprehensive geographic studies of densely populated, industrially saturated and highly urbanized areas, where social, economic and ecological problems are frequently entangled within a complex knot, could be quite effective. However, in order to achieve such effectiveness, in conducting their socio-economic studies the geographers must be always guided by Marxist-Leninist

methodology and proceed on the basis of the determining role of production forces and production relations in the development and territorial organization of settlements.

Many difficulties exist in the dissemination of progressive ideas in the field of geographic science. Geographic publications are produced by dozens of central, republic, departmental and other publishing houses on a virtually uncoordinated basis. Many of them do not even have specialized departments. There is virtually no coordination of publications. Still, demand for geographic publications (including specialized ones) is exceptionally high. As a rule, publications on geographic topics by the Nauka, Mysl', Progress, Gidrometeoizdat, Moscow University Press and other publishing houses are quickly sold out. Demand for publication series is increasing.

Among others, the publication of the 20-volume series "Countries and Peoples" (Izdatel'stvo Mysl') plays an important role. However, no similar work may be found in the area of economic geography of the Soviet Union (with the exception of the so-called "Blue Series," the publication of which was completed a quarter of a century ago). The positive impression created by the recently published monograph by M. B. Vol'f and Yu. D. Dmitrevskiy "Geografiya Mirovogo Sel'skogo Khozyaystva" [Geography of World Agriculture] (Mysl', Moscow, 1981) proves the expediency of the publication of a new series on "Geography of World Economic Sectors," the need for which has long become apparent.

The importance of geography as one of the components in human culture and the major role it plays in the patriotic education of the youth are unquestionable. In this connection, the energizing of the geographic editors in our publishing houses would be of positive political and educational importance. So far the number of such editorial boards is being reduced rather than increased.

The contemporary global situation related to the interaction between society and nature, an essential study of which may be found in the documents of the 25th and 26th CPSU Congresses, faces Soviet geography with a number of essentially important problems the solution of which will necessitate the taking of organizational steps. In our view, the USSR Academy of Sciences should set up a department of geographic sciences, in which economic geography and country studies would assume a suitable position along with physical geography; the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Geography should increase its work on general subjects (including general geography) with a view to drastically improving the coordination of geographic research conducted by academic and departmental scientific institutions, improving planning in the training and assignment of specialist geographers by the USSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education and the USSR Gosplan, based on the increased need for such specialists in the national economy and the revision of current tables of organization of many ministries and departments; the opening of a general geography department at the geography faculty of Moscow State University, with a view to training cadres who could engage in comprehensive general geographic studies; improving the teaching of economic geography ("location of production forces") in economic and other humanity

VUZs and increasing the corresponding training courses related to the study of the political map of the world and the geography of foreign (socialist above all) countries; and the organization by the USSR State Committee for Publishing of a Main Editorial Board in charge of geographic publications, and in the Mysl' publishing house an editorial section on the theory of geography and territorial problems of utilization of nature, and increasing publications related to the study of the country.

The implementation of such measures would be a major contribution to the further development of Soviet geography, as required by the contemporary stage in building communism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## AFTER ALL, WHO IS THE FRONTRANKER? ON COMPETITION CONDITIONS AND CRITERIA

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 76-83

[Article by Hero of Socialist Labor V. Cherfas, chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Krupskaya, Crimean Oblast]

[Text] We are familiar with the tremendously effective role of the competition in our labor life. It is precisely man's age-old competitiveness and rivalry that motivates him (sometimes more than good earnings) to work with total dedication and to experience the joy of labor and satisfaction with its results. This vision of ourselves against the background of others is important not only to each one of us individually, but to the collective at large and to agricultural enterprises in particular. Naturally, changes in economic conditions lead to changes in competition methods and criteria. The November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum emphasized the great importance today of adopting a realistic, a practical approach in the organization of all economic life. For this reason we think more profoundly about what to do in order to eliminate from the competition a certain "slogan-mongering" and efficiently direct it toward increased production effectiveness. The discussion which took place at the plenum on the need to expand the operational and economic autonomy of enterprises was essentially a discussion on mobilizing local initiative which is unquestionably helped by a proper organization of the competition.

How is the competition among farms organized currently and what considerations does it trigger?

As long as it is a matter of a single skill matters are more or less favorable. In particular, a milkmaid who has chosen in her group the best primiparas, who milks them properly and takes proper care of them, will justifiably earn social recognition. The same applies to drivers, rice growers and truck gardeners. In brief, wherever the entire work may be reduced to a common denominator, such as a comparable volume of output in physical terms, we can assess more or less accurately the quantity and quality of the specific work. The difficulty occurs when we must compare noncomparable items, i.e., the work of a viticulturalist and a truck gardener, or a livestock breeder and a mechanizer, within the sum total of joint activities in the framework of a single labor collective.

In order not to lose the simplicity of computation in physical terms, and in order to compare farming results efforts are made to combine various types of



work on the basis of a point rating system for each individual type of activity. Points are earned on the basis of indicators such as caring for young offspring in animal husbandry, gross output per 100 hectares, sale of output per 100 hectares, percentage of fulfillment of the plan for sales to the government, animal husbandry productivity, grain crop yields, and so on. However, regardless of how long the list of point ratings may be, a number of omitted additional important activities always remains. The point differentiation itself is arbitrary. Thrift indicators are inadmissibly ignored. Therefore, to reduce various types of work within the farm to a common denominator on a physical basis is not only difficult but, in my view, impossible.

The various types of work may be synthesized not directly but indirectly, with the help of value indicators such as gross income, profit, production cost, capital intensiveness and capital returns. As we know, the overall farm profitability indicator is particularly broad. It correlates the total revenue of the farm with production outlays. It is natural, therefore, to conclude that a farm which has achieved a greater revenue while spending relatively less work and materials per unit of output should be considered frontranking. It may appear that on the basis of this value indicator a comparison among farms could be as easy as among workers practicing identical skills, on the basis of physical indicators. In turns out, however, that this is not so simple as confirmed by the example of our rayon.

There are 10 kolkhozes in Nizhnegorskiy Rayon, Crimean Oblast. When we discuss the level of economic activities of any one of them we consider first of all essentially grain yield indicators. In this case we have something to be proud of. During the 10th Five-Year Plan the Kolkhoz imeni Krupskaya averaged 53.6 quintals of grain per hectare. Even during last year, which was droughty, it was able to counter the elements and to average 58.6 quintals. Good indicators have been reached by the Kolkhoz imeni Voykov as well. Yields here averaged respectively 48.3 and 54 quintals per hectare. The results achieved by the other rayon farms are substantially lower. For example, at the Bol'shevik Kolkhoz they are almost 50 percent lower. During the 10th Five-Year Plan the Zavety Il'icha Kolkhoz, which is our neighbor, averaged 20 quintals per year less than we did. This decisive circumstance affected the cost indicators of farm activities. Whereas in the two leading rayon kolkhozes the average annual farm profitability during the 10th Five-Year Plan was respectively 54.1 and 35.9 percent, in the last two it was 10.9 and 9.7 percent.

However, taking such results into consideration, could we simply say that the two leading farms--imeni Krupskaya and imeni Voykov--worked several hundred percent better than many others?

Officially, our farm is competing against the Zavety Il'icha Kolkhoz while the Kolkhoz imeni Voykov is competing against the Bol'shevik Kolkhoz. Let us point out the available agricultural productive capital and land and manpower resources of the competitors. During the 10th Five-Year Plan the Kolkhoz imeni Krupskaya had productive capital worth 16,058,000 rubles, while Zavety Il'icha had 11,533,000; the size of the farmland was approximately the same but our kolkhoz had 1,000 able-bodied people more! A similar situation

comes apparent in comparing the two other officially competing kolkhozes-- imeni Voykov and Bol'shevik. Productive capital of the former was assessed at 18,212,000 rubles, compared with 7,175,000 in the latter, i.e., here it was lower by more than one-half; the Kolkhoz imeni Voykov has 100 hectares of irrigated land and 600 able-bodied people more than its neighbor.

It is clear that this competition is taking place between farms classified in totally different "weight" categories. This has been a decisive step in turning this competition into a formal act only. Naturally, its results are of no use to anyone. Furthermore, in the strong farm the results may create an atmosphere of tolerance and complacency while in an average or weak farm they may trigger a feeling of doom. Both are fatal to the very idea of the competition which, conversely, should inspire all of its participants to look for and utilize existing growth possibilities.

Farms which have reached a roughly equal economic maturity and similar specialization should be competing within the same group. Specialization, which means a set of sectors and their share in the farm's economic structure is also very important. In our example, borrowed from current practice, for the reasons we stated the competition should be waged above all between two big and strong farms such as the kolkhozes imeni Krupskaya and imeni Voykov, which are similar in terms of production potential and structure. However, not economic but purely formal considerations were applied in organizing the competition, in which it was merely the location, the neighborhood of kolkhozes that was considered. This undermined the very foundations of the constructive force of the economic competition among farms (this is not to say that the stronger kolkhoz should not help his neighbor, for we do not refuse to give such help. However, this is no longer a competition among equals, which is precisely the subject of our discussion).

Naturally, a differentiated approach in the organization of the competition is necessary not for the sake of retaining the backwardness of less developed farms, which creates in them the false impression that under their circumstances no better work is possible. We know that it is possible to advance from a lower to a higher level faster than when all basic reserves have already been put to use. For example, it would be more difficult for our kolkhoz to go beyond 58 quintals of grain per hectare compared to farms whose average is under 30. Consequently, it should be a question of establishing a scientific norm which will show what the farm could achieve on the basis of its current production potential. Should computations and practical experience indicate that the farm with a given availability of capital assets, land and manpower, could yield a specific production result which has not been reached so far, how can we speak of a competition winner even when the indicator in the other farm is lower? The possibility of comparing achievements under existing conditions and real achievements eliminates limitations and enables farms with different production potentials to compete on an equal footing. In such cases, it may happen that a rich kolkhoz, which has reached higher indicators, may find itself among the lagging, having accomplished less than it could, or vice versa.

With such an organization of the competition it would be expedient to create on the rayon (and, respectively, the oblast) level a special material and technical fund from which the winners could freely obtain a certain amount of equipment and fertilizer, for the higher farming results become the higher become the amount of nutritive substances taken out of the soil and equipment outlays. Consequently, it would be only just to compensate the greater outlays of those who are ahead. I repeat, if the competition is organized on a differentiated basis, and if its winner may be also a kolkhoz which, although having achieved lesser results, has made full use of its production potential, this would provide equal conditions for both weak and strong farms for obtaining additional resources with which to develop their economy.

The competition gains strength when all of its participants are given material and moral incentives consistent with the results of their work. Material incentives are concentrated in the amount of the average monthly wage per worker. It is logical to assume that wherever the production standard is higher and the economic results of farming activities are better, labor should be paid higher than elsewhere. However, here is what happens in practice:

If we break down the rayon kolkhozes according to the level of their average monthly wage during the 10th Five-Year Plan, our farm, in particular, whose natural and value indicators are far higher than the others, would be only fifth (out of 10), while the Kolkhoz imeni Voykov would be fourth. The study of such data easily shows that there is no correlation between wages and end results. Incidentally, even grain per earned ruble is issued to all rayon farms on the basis of the same figure: 300 to 500 grams. The amount does not vary whether a kolkhoz has averaged 60 or 20 quintals per hectare (and, if there is no incentive, naturally there is no desire to produce more).

What is the reason for such destructive equalization? The point is that in the rayon kolkhozes (and, to the best of my knowledge, in the oblast and the republic) there is a more or less standardized operational payment for horse-manual and mechanized operations and for work in animal husbandry. The thick manuals clearly stipulate how much to pay for plowing a specific type of soil and for a specific length of row and how much to pay for cultivation under stipulated conditions. Naturally, however, the rating norms cannot stipulate what has been planted on this plowed and cultivated land. Therefore, the level of earnings depends above all on how profitable and numerous the individual labor operations are. Such arithmetic, which may be worsened by a lower quality of computations, enables weak farms to assume advantageous positions in terms of wage levels or, in any case, not to fall too far behind the leading farms (particularly if we take into consideration that in the latter the work is more intensive and skilled, judging from results).

The current system of incentives based on end results cannot correct this situation. Thus, it calls for the payment of bonuses based on percentages of overfulfillment of the production plan amounting to between 0.5 and 1 percent of the annual wage rate fund. Under planning conditions based on "the achieved level," in which the plan overfulfillment level becomes the standard



for the next plan (which makes its implementation increasingly harder), and under conditions in which the production plan is quite insufficiently related to the level of material and technical procurements (which sometimes makes the plan unrealistic), this type of incentive system remains on paper only. Its effectiveness cannot be felt by those who implement the production programs.

The effectiveness of the other incentive system, which is based on the material incentive fund, is equally low. To begin with, it does not go beyond the fulfillment of the marketing plan which, for some reason, does not take weather fluctuations into consideration. As a result, people who have been penalized by nature and who have worked under conditions more difficult than usual, are penalized a second time by not receiving their bonus. We believe that it is necessary for plans to be amended should exceptional weather conditions occur if the efficiency of the competition is to be enhanced. Last year, for example, when spring frosts hit the Crimean gardens during the blossoming period and farms suffered substantial losses, one correction coefficient or another could have been applied to the production marketing plans so that the people would not feel the futility of hoping for a bonus.

Currently many parts of the country are converting to a system of bonuses based on annual results in terms of the level reached over the past 5 years. However, this system as well would hardly yield any tangible results. To begin with, changes in the growth rates of output are possible only as a result of changes in the production base. Meanwhile, material and technical supplies are still poorly coordinated with the formulation of production targets. We quite frequently come across cases in which the plan calls for upgrading yields by 15 to 20 percent without supporting such growth with corresponding deliveries of fertilizer and equipment. Secondly, the strong farms which have made greater use of their production reserves would find themselves in a worse position (as I already pointed out, it is quite difficult to go beyond the 58-quintal level). Thirdly and finally, here again the bonus system is limited to physical indicators, although in our efforts to make the economy economical cost indicators could hardly be ignored.

The following problem arises as well: in some cases higher wages may affect cost and profitability indicators in such a way that a worse farm would look better than a strong one. This view is supported by the practical experience of our and other kolkhozes. Production costs include not only guaranteed wages but virtually all wage supplements (plus social insurance funds which, in our case, are substantial). As a result, the frontranking farms which harvest high yields and issue substantial additional wage supplements have higher costs. This artificially lowers their profitability with all consequences that this entails. The picture of economic reality, with such a profoundly differentiated wage system, may become substantially distorted: higher wages create the appearance of lowered profitability and, conversely, higher profitability is sometimes less the result of better farming than of relatively lower wages.

Therefore, a relatively complex situation has developed in the organization of the socialist competition. On the one hand, higher production indicators



must be substantially encouraged in material terms; on the other, we cannot agree with the fact that higher wages lead to a lower profitability level, profitability being one of the basic indicators of enterprise "health." Some economists suggest that at the end of the year the bonus fund not be based on wages and for the cost of the kolkhoz output to include guaranteed wages only. The bonus fund based on net income would become in this case either a source of a single bonus added to the fixed wages, awarded to working people who have particularly distinguished themselves, or be treated as an additional wage not included in any economic computation. It is obvious, however, that in some cases this would narrow the number of those who would benefit from the material incentive system; in others this would violate the accuracy of all economic factors such as profitability, efficiency, and so on. What is the solution to this problem?

Let us consider the main factors--the reasons and incentives for the production activities of the socialist enterprise. As we know, the main factor motivating the capitalist is maximal profit, i.e., net income. In general, the capitalist is not interested in the amount of newly created value (gross income). What matters to him is only the share remaining at his disposal. This is what guides all of his decisions and initiatives. In pursuing his objective, the capitalist is willing to save on everything, including blue- and white-collar worker wages, hygienic working conditions and safety equipment. One concession or another may be extracted in the course of the sharp class struggle waged by the workers. This, however, does not change the general tendency.

The motivations and incentives governing the development of socialist production, specifically kolkhoz production discussed here, are radically different. The kolkhoz members, the board and the chairman are interested above all in the end results of their work--the gross income. The higher the gross income is, the higher the wages and the more production and cultural projects can be built, and the higher the withholdings for social needs (pensions, aid to the aged and the needy, and so on) become. The kolkhoz members are the owners of the production process and, unlike the capitalist owner, naturally, they are not interested in saving on labor conditions and wages, i.e., for themselves, for the sake of their "net income." They are interested in the ratio between consumption and accumulation and, according to their bylaws, decide for themselves the amount of funds to be allocated for wages and for production expansion. Naturally, this ratio cannot be arbitrary. It is controlled by objective economic laws. If this year the kolkhoz board allocates more than it should for wages and if it fails to make corresponding industrial capital investments (reclamation, irrigation, etc.), after 1, 2 or 3 years the kolkhoz members may have to pay for this error. I have seen farms which, in an effort to outstrip their neighbors in wages, several years ago neglected cultural construction. When the time came, the young people began to leave such farms, which dealt the production process a painful blow.

Let us not dwell especially on the distribution of the gross income. Its essence is the following: V. I. Lenin wrote that under the serfdom system the organization of public labor was maintained on the discipline of the stick; under the capitalist system it was based on the discipline of hunger;

under the communist system, "the first step of which is socialism, it is maintained and, as time passes, will be maintained even further on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 14). Free and conscious discipline, and our concern for the future in our practical efforts, must be manifested precisely in the distribution of the gross income. A number of examples could be cited of people agreeing at general kolkhoz meetings with the suggested system for the distribution of the gross income which may appear stressed at that time. Convincing arguments and considerations of future development are usually successfully pitted against a consumerist approach.

Therefore, the size of the gross income is a criterion of activity and a relative assessment of the work of the farm. However, society, the socialist state and the enterprise itself are not indifferent to the means and outlays needed for reaching one volume of gross income or another. This fact must be known if we are to find the optimal production variant and reach an optimal efficiency of social outlays. It does matter to society whether a specific gross income is the result of 1,000 or 10,000 hectares. It is also important to know whether this required the concentration of dozens or hundreds of thousands of rubles' worth of productive capital, machines and buildings. If this is not known, it becomes simply impossible to determine the profitability or unprofitability of earning a specific amount of income. The amount of working capital (gasoline, chemicals, fertilizers) needed to achieve such results must also be taken into consideration. A common denominator must be found if such results are to be correlated with outlays. Under our circumstances this role is played by money. Hence, therefore, the urgent need for a monetary evaluation of the land, without which the real effect of outlays and its improvement could be hardly determined.

However, the kolkhoz is interested not only in improving efficiency and making sensible use of materials. The people are willing to invest their own labor for the sake of the highest possible returns and the benefit accruing to the state, the farm and the individual. However, we cannot fail to see the substantial differences between the nature of labor invested in a state enterprise and in a cooperative-kolkhoz one. Labor, as we know, is classified into necessary and surplus. At state enterprises this classification is made directly by the state: the workers earn a wage (necessary labor), while virtually the entire surplus labor goes to the benefit of the entire society, expanded production, creation of reserves and maintenance of the nonproduction area. Therefore, the state enterprise, in assessing the efficiency of its work, compares its results with all material and technical and necessary labor outlays. The efficiency with which surplus labor is used is the responsibility not of the enterprise but the state, which centralizes this part of labor as added product.

In a manner of speaking, the kolkhoz members are self-employed. Here not only the necessary but a considerable portion of the added product remains where it was created (another part, as we know, goes to meet national requirements through the price and taxation mechanisms). I repeat, the division between necessary and surplus kolkhoz labor, as stipulated in the bylaws,

is determined by the kolkhoz members themselves, based on production interests. Hence the computation of farming results must be based not on the share of the spent (necessary) labor but the entire amount of labor invested in production. Such labor, as we know, becomes materialized in the entire newly created values.

Without this, any computation of the efficiency of kolkhoz production could hardly be considered realistic. To sum it up briefly, let us say that current kolkhoz production profitability should be considered, in our view, as the ratio between the gross income and the productive and working capital (including wages) and, if possible, also in terms of the value assessment of agricultural capital. We believe that now, when substantial capital investments are being channeled into agriculture, and when we must be particularly concerned with their use, such a determination of the efficiency with which productive capital and land are used is extremely necessary, for with the present method for assessing profitability, the manner in which productive capital is used would be of no importance to us.

Incidentally, if we were to compute the profitability of our farm and compare it with the Kolkhoz imeni Voykov using the method I mentioned, the indicators would become significantly more similar (18.8 and 14.7 percent rather than 54.1 and 35.9 percent as currently computed). At the same time, agricultural profitability indicators become more comparable with corresponding indicators in industry (where the computation is also based on the entire productive capital). Otherwise agricultural profitability acquires a greatly embellished aspect compared with other types of production work.

Regardless of how important the general farm profitability indicator may be, in my view one can determine the real successes achieved by a kolkhoz only if we know the quantity of the gross income produced here per working person, for it is precisely out of this amount that we pay wages and meet the costs of cultural construction and production expansion. A high kolkhoz income immediately becomes small if it fails to provide scope for active economic efforts per working person.

It seems to me that the adoption of two such advanced indicators--the gross income norm and income per able-bodied person--would help us to make the socialist competition better organized and more effective. Until recently, its organization was essentially based on reaching one type of physical indicator or another. The use of economic indicators in socialist competition is proving to be very difficult. Today this becomes even more necessary, for we have set ourselves the task of making the socialist economy economical. Naturally, in the organization of the competition by sector and individual profession, the most important indicator should be output per 100 hectares of farmland and productivity per head of cattle. We also need a publicized and substantiated system for material and moral rewards for best achieved results on the scale of the oblast, zone, and republic.

Allow me to point out one more aspect of this general problem. With every passing year we feel more and more urgently that our production successes depend not only on agrotechnical and economic but on social measures as well.

No one would argue the importance of the type of work done at a livestock farm, the feed preparation system or equipment repairs. All such activities, however, are largely backed by the extent to which the farm has kindergartens, an extended school day, organized public catering and its quality, and so on and so forth.

Unfortunately, many aspects of the work of the kolkhoz chairman and board in this direction remain socially ignored. A chairman is praised for a good crop, milk yields and hauling manure to the fields. This is proper, this should be done, for no success in the social area is possible without a material base, simply without money, if social and cultural measures are to be financed. However, production successes are rarely linked with a wide social construction program. Construction is a rather bothersome matter and few are the economic managers who agree to assume the excessive trouble related to it. Every practical worker knows the difficulty of procuring construction materials, obtaining a design and interesting a contractor in the work.... Nevertheless, today the normal development of an agricultural enterprise is impossible without it.

Strange though it seems, to this day socialist competition among farms has not been extended or aimed at reaching specific social development indicators. In my view, the time has come for each rayon to keep social statistics reflecting the development of this area of our lives. The above-average progress achieved by some farms should be kept under the same social observation as the wintering of the cattle, feed procurements and field operations.

Finally, here is another important feature. As one who has been a kolkhoz chairman for 27 years, it seems to me necessary for the farms themselves to be able to influence the organization of the socialist competition to a greater extent. I believe that the role of the kolkhoz councils on all levels (I am speaking in my capacity as member of the Union Council of Kolkhozes) should be expanded in its development. All of this, in my view, would enable us to compete purposefully and efficiently, the more so now, when agroindustrial associations have been created and when a comparison among results can be focused to an even greater extent not only on the product harvested on kolkhoz fields but the product delivered to the consumer. We are prompted in this direction by the tasks earmarked in the Food Program and the November 1982 party Central Committee plenum, which we must implement.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11



## CONSISTENT INTERNATIONALIST

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 84-90

[Article by S. Belenkov, candidate of historical sciences]

[Text] This is what Jacques Duclos, the noted leader of the French and international communist movement, wrote about Joseph Jacquemotte: "He was one of those fighters dedicated body and soul to his cause, who saw in it the meaning and purpose of his entire life."

Let us agree that it is no simple matter to deserve such a party-minded and human evaluation. The life of this outstanding Belgian proletarian revolutionary speaks for itself. This was the path of a people's tribune, the path of an internationalist. "There is probably no more splendid novel than J. Jacquemotte's life--the life of the founder of the Belgian Communist Party. Such a life cannot be described. It is too simple and too large to become compressed in a few pages." These are the words of a close fellow worker of this outstanding revolutionary, Belgian labor movement veteran F. Demany.

Joseph Jacquemotte was born on 22 April 1883 to a Brussels working family. School and a short military service, which he soon abandoned because of poor eyesight, were the initial stages in the life of the young man. At age 17 Joseph began his working career in the largest general store in Brussels, owned by the Bernheim and Meyer Company--a kind of Belgian variant of Zola's "Ladies' Happiness." Jacquemotte's acute social perception allowed him quickly to identify the exploiting nature of the owners who handled their lair like medieval feudal lords. He called upon his comrades to join a trade union to defend their violated interests. Jacquemotte's trade union activities led to his being fired. In search for work from one company to another, he gained valuable experience in trade union work, became a noted activist in the Belgian Workers Party (BWP) and organized a number of strikes.

Jacquemotte was unanimously elected secretary of the trade union socialist employees in April 1910. Jeff's (the familiar nickname by which he was known by the working people in Brussels) popularity increased. He could be seen at the gates of plants and factories more and more frequently. The struggle he headed at that time frequently developed into most violent conflicts with the owners, involving strikes, demonstrations, picketing, or boycotting companies which ignored trade union demands. Jacquemotte was repeatedly detained and interrogated. However, this did not stop the "rebel." He was sentenced to a jail term for heading a strike by department store employees in 1912.

However, he did not consider even the time spent in jail as lost in terms of his life and struggle. He accepted this trial as a training period of backing with theoretical studies the political convictions he developed in the course of the struggle.

The minister of justice hastily ordered that Jacquemotte be released from jail 2 days ahead of term when he found out that the working people in Brussels intended to turn the release of their leader into a great demonstration.

On the eve of World War I Jacquemotte was elected member of the Bureau of the United Brussels Trade Unions and the Bureau of the Trade Union Commission (a central association of Belgian trade unions). By then he had already become a convinced "revolutionary trade unionist," who saw in direct mass action the key to the success of the workers' cause. His position clearly opposed reformism and the parliamentary limitations of the leadership of the Belgian Workers Party. In the party Jacquemotte was the leader of its revolutionary minority and in his initial speech at the party's congress he daringly attacked the opportunism of its leaders, including the "boss" himself, E. Vanderwelde.

Gradually Jacquemotte adopted Marxism as the theory which provided the only true answers to the vital problems of the labor movement and which inspired it to direct revolutionary action. The labor leader was tremendously influenced by the October Revolution in Russia. Jacquemotte enthusiastically welcomed the historical changes made by the bolsheviks. Despite the difficult conditions created by the German occupation, he published his pamphlet "The Russian Revolution" clandestinely and anonymously. This was the first true word on the Soviet Republic in Belgium.

The Belgian internationalist persistently defended the young state of workers and peasants. Somewhat later, in October 1919, he raised the slogan, "The Cause of the Russian Proletariat Is Our Cause." He sharply criticized the social democratic newspaper LE PEUPLE for its attacks on Lenin and pandering to Kolchak at the 30th Belgian Workers Party Congress. He developed the idea that even a labor party which comes to power as a result of universal elections should impose a proletarian dictatorship in order to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie interested in the preservation of the exploiting system.

Jacquemotte struggled against attempts to restore the Second International, which had crumbled under the weight of opportunism and chauvinism. On the eve of the Geneva Conference, which had been convened to this effect, he wrote in the newspaper L'EXPLOITE ("The Exploited"), of which he had been the editor in chief since November 1918, in July 1920 that "in Geneva the ghosts will discuss how to revive what they themselves killed. Geneva is the past. Socialism, however, based on class struggle, is a living force, an active beginning. It is precisely toward Moscow and the Third International that the proletariat the world over is increasingly turning. Turning to the Great Revolution, today they are expressing their own hopes for liberation.... The

delegates of the revolutionary proletariat are drafting the salvation doctrine in the throne room of the Kremlin, where reaction ruled for centuries. Moscow is the future" (L'EXPLOITE, 25 July 1920).

In August 1920, when the French government was granted permission by Belgium to haul through its territory weapons for Pilsudski's anti-Soviet adventure, Jacquemotte and his comrades organized a mass protest campaign. The leader of the Belgian internationalists addressed himself to the workers as follows: "Not one man, not one penny, not one gun, not one shell, not one bullet, not one vehicle for the enemies of the first Red Republic! Let us expand our action. Let us make the bourgeois governments the world over--including ours--officially to recognize the Soviet system. Long live the Russian Proletarian Republic!" (L'EXPLOITE, 19 August 1920).

L'EXPLOITE became the center of the revolutionary opposition within the BWP. The reformist democratic leaders gave Jacquemotte, who had become a member of the bureau of the BWP General Council in 1919, an ultimatum: the newspaper was to cease publication and the group of its supporters was to be disbanded. Jacquemotte rejected this demand unacceptable to the revolutionaries, as a result of which he was expelled from the party. The question of establishing an independent Marxist-Leninist organization of the working class was put on the agenda. As an experienced labor leader, Jacquemotte fully realized the difficulties which he would have to face as a result of a full ideological and organizational separation from the large BWP. He warned of the inadmissibility of creating a sect outside the working class: "I do not trust groups who give their movement the nature of a closed circle. A movement must be a mass movement." Jacquemotte believed that a proper policy will become the base for the strength and influence of the newly created party.

In May 1921, at their third congress, the "Friends of L'EXPLOITE" decided to join the Communist International. On 4 February 1921, on the Comintern's recommendation, Jacquemotte's supporters joined the other Belgian communist organizations in a communist party. At its first congress, Jacquemotte said that the creation of a purely political party is more difficult in Belgium than anywhere else, for never before had the Belgian working people had a purely political party. The party's newspaper LE DRAPEAU ROUGE ["The Red Flag"], which Jacquemotte managed for the rest of his life, was founded in November 1921.

The communist party immediately faced the need to surmount the "childhood disease" of sectarianism and antiparlamentarianism, not to mention the fact that its establishment was hindered by the atmosphere of hostility encouraged by the bourgeoisie and the right-wing socialists. Jacquemotte waged the struggle relying on his extremely rich experience of work in the trade unions and as a public speaker. He proceeded from the fact that anticommunist prejudices do not disappear immediately but must be surmounted as the masses themselves, on the basis of personal experience, realize the justice of the party's cause. When the Borinage miners' strike broke out in 1923, the communists and Jacquemotte, their leader, were in the leading ranks.

Worried by the success of the strike and the growing prestige of the recently created communist party, the bourgeoisie decided to strike back underhandedly. A myth of the "great communist conspiracy" was fabricated. The yellow press mounted an unrestrained campaign of persecution and fabrications and the reactionaries asked that the communists be dealt with. As a result, Jacquemotte and 14 of his comrades were arrested and charged with "conspiracy against the security of the state."

In jail Jacquemotte wrote the pamphlet "'The Great Communist Conspiracy'--A Weapon of the Militant Bourgeoisie." In the pamphlet, which was smuggled out, the Belgian communist wrote: "Whatever the outcome of the trial may be, the historical development of capitalism, which is raising the toiling masses against the rich minority, can be neither turned back nor stopped. Communism is invincible for it carries the future within it. All policemen, judges, prosecutors and courts of the bourgeoisie will not prevent the building of a communist society. In the face of the unrestrained Belgian reaction...the strength of belief in the final triumph of the proletariat and the warm hope for an imminent victory support those who, in the heat of battle experience the harshest blows" (see F. Demany, "Joseph Jacquemotte. Images d'une vie" [Joseph Jacquemotte. Pictures of a Life]. Brussels, 1946, p 27).

From the very beginning of the trial, Jacquemotte seized the initiative at the Palace of Justice, surrounded by 300 policemen. As the socialist newspaper LE TRAVAILLEUR wrote at that time, "The leader of the communists is more familiar with his case than the gentleman representing justice. Occasionally one unwittingly wonders whether the defendant himself is conducting the debates." Gradually, as the trial progressed, the "conspiracy" seemed to be forgotten and the trial turned to the question of the communist program. Jacquemotte proved himself a brilliant polemicist and a convinced defender of his party and the communist cause. He answered the questions of the prosecution with great self-control.

"What is your idea of the fatherland?" the judge asked the Belgian internationalist.

"We say that a person can live for his homeland while you are asking him to die for it!" Jacquemotte answered.

"What would you do with the petty owners should you win?" was another "tricky" question asked by the judge.

"We contemplate the nationalization of big capital only."

"Where do you draw the line?" the judge persisted.

"We cannot know the possible rate of exchange of the Belgian franc at the time of the revolution," Jacquemotte answered.

Here is another example. As Jacquemotte was describing the attitude of the communists toward the army, the judge interrupted him rudely: "You do not have to shout, there are no soldiers here!" "Untrue," instantly objected



Jacquemotte. "There are policemen here and even policemen could eventually become communists."

Instead of discrediting the ideas of communism, which the reaction was hoping to accomplish, the trial of the "great conspiracy" turned into a propaganda rostrum. The answers of the leader of the communist party were quoted everywhere like aphorisms. E. Vanderwelde himself was one of the witnesses at the trial. Asked by the lawyer whether this "conspiracy" would not increase the sympathy felt by the masses for the communist party, the apostle of reformism was forced to acknowledge bitterly that "the working class always sympathizes with those who are persecuted." On 16 July 1923 the jury declared the communists innocent. According to Jacquemotte the trial was the "party's baptism by fire."

Jacquemotte was elected the first representative of the communist party in the Belgian Parliament in Brussels in 1925. Despite the conspiracy of silence surrounding the only spokesman for the working people, organized by the bourgeoisie, the social democrats and their "free" press, he was able to make his mandate an effective means for defending the interests of the people and exposing reformist policy. He turned the parliament into a daily arena of struggle in defense of strikers, against the financial machinations of the monopolies, against efforts to curtail the rights and freedoms of the working people and in support of the struggle against militarism and colonialism.

Within the party Jacquemotte defended the Comintern line and opposed opportunism and sectarianism. He proved that the "Russian problem," which was then at the center of the class confrontation, was a basic problem of the struggle against extreme revolutionary phraseology, sectarianism and adventurist urging-on of the revolution. In the course of this difficult struggle, Jacquemotte considered at length the roots and nature of sectarianism, which he considered the main reason for the weakness of the communist parties. He was not satisfied with the success at the 1932 parliamentary elections, when the increased prestige of the party members, after a general strike, led to the election of a second representative of the Belgian Communist Party.

At the National Party Conference, which was held in Charleroi in April 1935, the secretary general of the Belgian Communist Party appealed with true Leninist directness for decisively uprooting the way of thinking and concepts which left the communist party outside the real movement of the working class, scorn and hostility toward socialist workers and mistrust of the possibilities of the masses. "Why is the communist party remaining weak, isolated from the masses, and unable to organize a struggle against the bourgeoisie on a broad scale?... The answer to this most important question is the following: the reason is sectarianism, which has always significantly influenced our tactics" ("Joseph Jacquemotte--une grande figure du mouvement ouvrier belge" [Joseph Jacquemotte--A Great Personality in the Belgian Labor Movement]. Brussels, 1963, pp 172-173).

On the basis of the experience of the Belgian and other labor movement detachments, Jacquemotte reached the same basic conclusions which, among

others, became the foundations of the resolutions of the Seventh Comintern Congress. In his frank and profound speech at the congress, he spoke of the means for converting a small party of propagandists into a mass party and insisted that this task was relevant to a number of national sections within the Comintern. He linked its solution to the strategy of working class unity, popular front and struggle against fascism and war, which were discussed in G. Dimitrov's speech. At the congress Jacquemotte was elected candidate member of the Comintern Executive Committee.

Jacquemotte's consistent and flexible activities in implementing the new communist party course yielded results. The ideas of worker unity and creation of a popular front became extremely popular among the toiling masses. Despite the fact that the reformist BWP leadership rejected the formation of a popular front on a national scale, a union was being developed among leftist forces in the local areas. A mass socialist and communist demonstration was held in Brussels on 11 November 1935 under the slogan "Together Against Fascism and Together in the Defense of Peace." The communist party expanded and strengthened. As a result of the 24 May 1936 elections nine communists were elected members of the Belgian Parliament. As leader of the Belgian Communist Party faction, Joseph Jacquemotte submitted to King Leopold III the demands of the communists and the toiling people regarding Belgium's foreign policy which, as he stated, should be based on three principles: collective security, indivisibility of peace and mutual aid treaties with all countries which try to defend peace through their actions: "By this I mean Belgium's participation, together with France and Czechoslovakia, in treaties for mutual aid with the Soviet Union" (LE DRAPEAU ROUGE, 3 June 1936).

Following the establishment of normal diplomatic relations between Belgium and the USSR on 12 July 1935, Jacquemotte addressed the parliament. He welcomed this event as a new proof of the increased power and international prestige of the Soviet Union. He also described it as a victory by the toiling masses of his country, the communists and all progressive forces over the Belgian bourgeoisie and the right-wing social democratic leadership, who were directly involved in the fierce attacks mounted by world imperialism against the country of the October Revolution and who had persistently refused--for nearly 18 years--to acknowledge the irreversibility of the changes that had occurred.

As a systematic internationalist, Joseph raised his voice in defense of all fighters for social justice, all class brothers, and all the oppressed and suffering from imperialist exploitation and aggression: the Congolese who had risen against colonial oppression, the German communists opposing fascism, the Spanish republicans and the Abyssinian patriots. Equally alien to him were national exclusivity and neglect of the characteristics and traditions of the Walloons and Flemish in Belgium.

The last days of Jacquemotte's life were marked by his profound aspiration to unite the working class and creatively to apply under Belgian conditions the course set at the Seventh Comintern Congress. Jacquemotte dedicated all his forces to the preparations for the Sixth Belgian Communist Party Congress. However, the heart of this fiery fighter was unable to withstand the tremendous stress. Three weeks before the inauguration of the congress, on 11

October 1936, he died suddenly as he traveled from Liege to Brussels. At that time PRAVDA wrote: "The communist movement has lost in Comrade Jacquemotte one of its most noted personalities and one of the greatest leaders of the Belgian working class, an infinitely loyal fighter for the cause of the proletarian revolution...."

Jacquemotte's name was and remains the synonym for dedicated struggle against militarism, aggression and reaction, a synonym for the international solidarity with victorious socialism and creative application of the Leninist principles. His name appears on the front page of each issue of LE DRAPEAU ROUGE, which he founded.

The struggle waged by the Belgian communist is taking place under difficult circumstances in the 1980s. The protracted economic crisis has taken dramatic forms in Belgium: one out of seven able-bodied Belgians is unemployed. The social consequences of the scientific and technical revolution are having a strange effect in this highly developed country. Problems of inflation and the worsening of the environment are rising with unprecedented gravity. However, as during Jacquemotte's time, the ruling classes are trying to resolve such problems at the expense of the working people by mounting a real "crusade" against the socioeconomic gains of the working class.

In the resolution adopted at its 24th congress (March 1982) the Belgian Communist Party stated that "a solution to the crisis can be found only in fundamental social changes, i.e., in the direction of socialism" (LE DRAPEAU ROUGE, 3-4 April 1982).

In the view of the Belgian communists, the solution of this problem presumes the existence of a single influential revolutionary party standing on class positions, acting as the real "motor" of the labor movement. This was Jacquemotte's dream for his party.

The antimilitaristic spirit, so typical of Jacquemotte, imbues the thousands-strong demonstrations mounted by Walloons and Flemish against plans for deploying American missiles on Belgian territory. Louis Van (Gayt), Belgian Communist Party chairman, has described the problem of the missiles as the "key problem of political struggle" in the country. The communists are not alone in the antimissile movement: various organizations and parties have spoken out against the threat of war. The country's peace-loving forces are welcoming with interest and hope the initiatives of the socialist countries. In January 1983 the Communist Party of Belgium Central Committee Politburo called upon the Belgian government to help the implementation of opportunities favoring peace, provided by the new constructive proposals formulated by Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and in the Political Declaration of Warsaw Pact members.

The efficiency of the class platform is not liked by those favoring a "third" intermediary position in the historical confrontation between the two worlds, "equidistant" from the aggressive NATO bloc and the defensive alliance of socialist countries. Attempts to lead the party along that way were rejected at the 24th Belgian Communist Party Congress. As Louis Van (Gayt) said, "the arms race is not encouraged by 'both sides' but by the most aggressive



American imperialist and NATO leading circles. This is a reflection of the crisis in global capitalism. The USSR and its allies are the counterbalance and its unilateral weakening would be dangerous to the cause of peace" (LE DRAPEAU ROUGE, 27-28 March 1982).

The traditions of the struggle waged by Jacquemotte are today undergoing a major test. The bourgeoisie and the reformist press are applying concentrated pressure on the communists. They are called upon to reject Jacquemotte's behests and their own roots as well as anything which constitutes their strength and independence and which has allowed the communist party to strengthen and win victories. "Specialists" in the history of the labor movement writing in this press are insinuating to the communists that the history of the Belgian Communist Party is a chain of errors and blunders and that their leaders are noble yet helpless utopians, and that only a break with the "legacy of the Comintern" and the combat traditions of proletarian solidarity and the socialist world would allegedly allow the communist party to strengthen its influence and to combine socialist objectives with the canons of Western democracy. To all this today as well Jacquemotte's words would provide the answer: "One should choose: to be entirely on the side of the haves or the exploited!"

Jacquemotte himself provided brilliant examples of such a truly Leninist approach to his country's problems. Less than anything else he resembled a politician who made life fit prefabricated plans. He considered the study of the specific and varied struggle of the masses the main source of political wisdom and a prerequisite for the successful application of Marxist-Leninist principles. Answering those who suggest to the communists to reject Lenin, C. Renard, Communist Party of Belgium vice president, emphasized that "today's Marxism would not have the rich future predicted for it had it not adopted and integrated within itself the historical contribution of Leninism" (CAHIERS MARXISTES, No 109, 1982, p 38).

In marking the centennial of the birth of the founder of the Belgian Communist Party, the communists in his homeland and other countries are not only rendering a profound homage to the memory of one of those who were at the origins of the contemporary communist movement and loyal friends of the homeland of the October Revolution. To them the history of the life and struggle of Joseph Jacquemotte is a rich source of thoughts on the traditions and lessons of the labor movement and an instructive example of the way the internationalist and Marxist-Leninist policy of the communist party is blazing a path from one victory to another despite the desperate resistance of class enemies. Marcel Cachin wrote about Jacquemotte that "this man, simple as all great men are, would have preferred, instead of all the honors, that the efforts of his life dedicated to the people be continued. That is how the heirs of his cause think and that is the way it should be."

To this day the example set by Joseph Jacquemotte inspires in Belgium all consistent internationalists and fighters for the unity of the working class and against imperialism and war.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983



## OUTSTANDING REVOLUTIONARY AND THINKER

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 91-100

[Review by V. Bogorad, candidate of historical sciences, of the book "Pal'miro Tol'yatti. Ocherk Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti" [Palmiro Togliatti. Essay on His Life and Activities] by N. P. Komolova and G. S. Filatov. Politizdat, Moscow, 1983, 222 pages]

[Text] Palmiro Togliatti belongs to the generation of 20th century revolutionaries whose ideological and political formation was directly influenced by the Great October Socialist Revolution and Lenin's doctrines and behests. His entire life was a model of selfless service to the cause of the international working class and the ideals of peace, democracy and socialism. This book, written by Soviet Italianists, depicts Togliatti as an enthusiastic internationalist, inspirer and organizer of the armed struggle waged by the Italian working people against fascist tyranny, major political leader and theoretician who left a noticeable trace in the development of Marxist thought. This is the first scientific biography of Togliatti published in our country. The book came out on a significant date: the 90th birthday of this outstanding personality of the Italian and international communist and worker movements.

The study is based on Togliatti's works and documents, published in Russian and Italian, and the recollections of his brothers-in-arms: L. Longo, G. Amendoli, P. Secchi, U. Massoli, M. Montaniani, G. Cierreti and others. The authors have drawn on the works of Italian Marxists E. Raggionieri, P. Spriano, Marcelli and Maurizio Ferrara and of foreign historians of different political convictions. The use of such a broad range of sources and general works of history, generally unfamiliar to Soviet readers, has enabled the authors to cover various aspects of Togliatti's biography and to provide a sufficiently full study of his ideological and political activities.

Antonio Gramsci, who later became the leader of the Italian communists, played a tremendous role in Togliatti's spiritual development and fate. The two first met during the entrance examinations at Turin University in 1911. It was then that, as an already convinced supporter of the socialist outlook, A. Gramsci became Togliatti's actual teacher and tutor. "Gramsci stood considerably above me in terms of cultural development and intellectual and political experience, and it was his guidance that helped me at that time to find my to find my orientation," Togliatti was to recall later (P. Togliatti, "Gramsci," Rome, 1977, p 75).

Togliatti was still a student when he came to Marxism through the scientific-philosophical reinterpretation of German classical philosophy. He became familiar with the works of Antonio Labriola, which were highly valued by V. I. Lenin. He then turned directly to the works of K. Marx and F. Engels. His adoption of Marxism and the ties he established with Turin workers led to a qualitative change in his spiritual development. Actually, Togliatti followed the same path as Gramsci, whose major source of sociopolitical outlook was, it is true, shaped by yet another factor: a profound and specific familiarity with the living conditions of the oppressed Sardinian masses, the peasantry above all. This enabled Gramsci subsequently to formulate a scientific agrarian program of the communist party. In turn, this had a considerable influence on Togliatti's views on the peasant problem. This, as we know, played a major role in the way the communists organized their revolutionary work in the countryside and made the ICP the mass party of the Italian working people.

Gramsci and Togliatti were among the then still small galaxy of Italian socialists who consciously tried to direct all their efforts toward a systematic struggle for the abolishment of the capitalist rule and for socialism.

The victory of the Great October and the creation of the first proletarian state in the world provided a living example of victorious outcome in the battle against capitalism. They struck a strongest possible blow at the reformist concepts within the opportunistic wing of the Italian labor movement, accelerated the process of revolutionary maturing of the masses and helped them to see the specific prospects of the struggle.

Gramsci and Togliatti, who founded ORDINE NUOVO, a socialist weekly, in Turin, in 1919, prepared the publication of a number of Lenin's works, thus taking the first and very important step in the dissemination of Leninism among Italian workers. "Lenin's works and bolshevik party documents were in demand," Togliatti was to remark later. "They were awaited with passionate impatience, translated, read and collectively discussed, interpreted and disseminated in the factories" (P. Togliatti, "Izbr. Stat'i i Rech'i" [Selected Articles and Speeches], Moscow, 1965, vol I, p 198). One of Togliatti's first articles in ORDINE NUOVO was on the international significance of the Russian Revolution.

Togliatti personally participated in leading the revolutionary struggle waged by Turin's workers. He actively worked for making the Italian Socialist Party truly revolutionary.

The situation urgently called for the immediate creation of such a party, the more so since the weakness of the labor movement was used by the extreme reaction which was comprehensively organizing fascist groups. The number of members favoring affiliation with the Third Communist International was increasing in the ranks of the ISP. The primary organizations, in the industrial centers mainly, were voicing this demand with increasing firmness. In this matter the position of the Turin ISP section, in which Gramsci and Togliatti played a leading role, was of particular importance. In May 1920 it adopted a programmatic document of historical significance entitled "For the Renovation of the Socialist Party." The document stated that the Italian revolutionary movement puts on the agenda the question of the assumption of political power by the proletariat, that such power cannot be reached through parliamentary

means and that it requires the establishment of proletarian dictatorship and the creation of new revolutionary organs -- soviets. The document stressed that the socialists' loss of initiative in the struggle could cost dearly the Italian working class and trigger a "raging reactionary outburst."

As we know, the document of the Turin socialists was highly rated by Lenin.

In the autumn of 1920, when a widespread movement for the seizure of enterprises by the workers developed initially in Turin and subsequently in other cities, Togliatti personally participated in its leadership. He attended sessions of plant commissions, addressed numerous meetings and urged the ISP leaders to lend their full support to this movement and to give it a political nature. As secretary of the Turin section, Togliatti persistently worked for its unification under the slogans of the Communist International, breaking with the reformists and creating a combat revolutionary party.

The ideological and political struggle within the ISP led to the consolidation of the supporters of a revolutionary renovation of the party within a communist faction and the founding of the Italian Communist Party in January 1921.

The founding of a party of the proletarian vanguard, numerically small but filled with the spirit of revolutionary struggle, was only the first step in surmounting the weaknesses within the Italian labor movement. The most revolutionary segment of the working class was freed from the influence of reformism. "As a whole, the 58,000 communists represented at the Livorno congress was the truly best, youngest, firmest and most conscientious and combat capable segment of the socialist party," Togliatti pointed out (P. Togliatti, "Ital'yanskaya Kommunisticheskaya Partiya" [The Italian Communist Party], Moscow, 1959, p 39).

The founding of the ICP, although a turning point in the history of the country's revolutionary movement, was in itself not an indication that it immediately became the true leader of the masses. Under Italian conditions this process took 2 decades. The assumption of the party's leadership by a Marxist-Leninist nucleus, headed by Gramsci was an important landmark along this road.

Together with Gramsci Togliatti was one of the organizers of the party's third congress, which was held in Lyons in January 1926 and which adopted the revolutionary programmatic documents.

At the congress Togliatti spoke of the trade unions. He formulated the daring suggestion of penetrating the fascist trade unions and working inside them for the erosion of the mass base of fascism. The proposal took Italian reality into consideration and was based on Lenin's idea of the need to work wherever the masses are to be found.

Lenin's advice plays a tremendous role in the struggle for the transformation of the ICP into a truly Marxist party. Speaking of the most important aspects of his contribution to the establishment and development of the ICP as a proletarian party of a new type, the following should be emphasized: Lenin clearly saw the entire variety of possible ways in the development of the political struggle in the West. His conclusion regarding the political feature



of imperialism as reactionary along all of its lines meant, as refracted through the tasks of the workers movement, the need to increase the promotion of democracy as a structural component of the struggle for socialism. In the course of the sharp discussions he held with some Italian communists, the leader of the world proletariat emphasized that it was precisely in the most developed capitalist countries that it was particularly important to gain an influence among the broadest possible masses of the working class and all working people. At the 4th Comintern Congress Lenin called upon the foreign communists comprehensively to strengthen their communist parties, to master all forms of revolutionary activity among the masses on the basis of the creative interpretation of the experience of the Russian Revolution, to train the working people in the art of the class struggle and to teach them to develop a revolutionary attitude toward their own political experience.

Togliatti took over the party's leadership after Gramsci's arrest in November 1926. For many years he headed the Foreign Center of the ICP, directed the clandestine communist struggle in the country and edited STATO E OPERAIO, the party's theoretical organ.

Togliatti combined such various activities with a tremendous amount of work in the Comintern (under the pseudonym Ercole Ercoli). In particular, he played an exceptionally important role in the preparations for and holding of the 7th Comintern Congress, in the summer of 1935, which formulated a new strategic and tactical line of the communist movement in the struggle against fascism and war. At the congress Togliatti delivered the outstanding speech "On the Tasks of the Comintern in Connection of the Imperialist Preparations for a New World War." The congress reelected Togliatti to the membership of the leading organs of the Communist International Executive committee.

During the people's antifascist war in Spain Togliatti, who represented the Comintern's Executive Committee to the Spanish Communist Party (as Comrade Alfredo), was one of the organizers and heads of the International Brigades which fought on the side of the Spanish republicans.

In accordance with the Leninist orientation, which was developed further at the 7th Comintern Congress, Togliatti tried to meet the objectively developing needs of the proletarian struggle in Italy. He focused his attention on exposing the class nature of fascism and the study of its social base.

As the book under review convincingly proves, the fascist indoctrination of the masses was facilitated by the fact that fascism had been able to entangle the Italian working people in a web of mass organizations, after having destroyed entirely the class organizations of the proletariat. The destruction of this web and blocking the channels through which fascist ideology influenced the masses was a decisive prerequisite in the struggle against fascism. It was on this difficult sector of mass ideological and political work that the Italian communists focussed their main efforts.

They began by energizing their activities in the mass organizations of the proletariat -- trade union, cultural and recreational -- and in the peasant associations. The communists tried to find the most vulnerable fascist sectors and concentrated their efforts precisely on them. As Togliatti



emphasized, in the fascist trade unions they were the plants and the plant trade union representatives, the local trade unions and the general assembly of its members and the conclusion of collective labor agreements (see P. Togliatti, "Lektsii o Fashizme" [Lectures on Fascism]. Moscow, 1974, p 115).

The huge volume of theoretically summed-up experience gained in the field of communist work among the masses in various countries even under the most difficult and extremely aggravated conditions of the class struggle remains relevant to this day. The communist movement in a given country can be successful only if it studies the various experiences of other fraternal parties. The purpose of such study, as Lenin pointed out, is not the mechanical duplication of historically developed forms of struggle under different sociopolitical circumstance, but finding, on the basis of the creative interpretation of the very rich international experience, the most expedient ways of struggle for democratic change, peace and socialism under specific circumstances.

The conditions under which the class struggle is waged in capitalist countries change, sometimes unexpectedly. That is why the task of mastering all forms of revolutionary action, tested through the experience of many communist generations, remains entirely topical.

The reader will find extensive new information in the chapters on Togliatti's activities during World War II and in the Resistance. Immediately after fascist Germany's attack on the Soviet Union Togliatti, who was working in Moscow for the Comintern at that time, began to broadcast regularly to Italy over Radio Moscow. Addressing his compatriots under the name of Mario Correnti, Togliatti expressed the confidence that fascism, which had dragged the Italian people into the war, would inevitably crumble under the burden of military defeats. He described the heroic liberation struggle waged by the Soviet people. Togliatti's internationalism and understanding of the tremendous and decisive role which the Soviet Union played in the struggle against fascism and for the freedom and independence of its people and the peoples through Europe were manifested with particular clarity at that time. "We always remember," Togliatti said soon after the Italian government broke relations with Hitlerite Germany, "that today we would not have been free without the victories at Moscow, Stalingrad, the Don, Orel and the Donbass..." (P. Togliatti, "Opere" [Works], Rome, vol 4, book 2, p 480).

Togliatti's appeal to the Italian people to wage an antifascist struggle was based on the tremendous and risky organizational work done by the Italian Communist Party acting in deep clandestinity, work which became particularly energized in 1943, when a radical change occurred on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War. A powerful guerrilla movement developed on Italian territory occupied by the Hitlerites. The Garibaldi units, created on communist initiative, headed the armed struggle. The combination of the armed struggle with worker actions in factories and plants became the distinguishing feature of the Italian resistance.

Back in his homeland after many years of forced exile, in 1944, Togliatti's activities concentrated on the great historical goal of the definitive defeat of fascism. His tremendous reputation, perfect understanding of domestic and international circumstances, inordinate energy and willpower greatly

contributed to the fact that the antifascist parties, postponing their arguments on the future governmental structure for after the war, united in the struggle for the definitive elimination of fascism and the national liberation of the country. This made the formation of a coalition government with the participation of the working class parties -- the socialist and the communist -- and the increased scope of the armed partisan warfare possible.

The authors cite excerpts from Togliatti's war years "Diary." The reader will find interesting details on the way the communist leader defended within the cabinet the political line most consistent with the interests of the working class and other progressive forces, and promoted the purging of the governmental machinery from fascist elements, the solution of urgent socioeconomic problems in the interest of the working people, and giving effective material aid to the partisan units. Well acquainted with the situation in the liberated part of the country and in the area under Hitlerite occupation, Togliatti skillfully coordinated the work of the party which had to operate under such disparate conditions. Togliatti was the author of the 1944 directive issued by the communist party leadership on preparing the national armed uprising of the Italian people. When the Anglo-American military administration and the Italian reactionaries began to maneuver to wreck the planned uprising in the spring of 1945, Togliatti sent firm and decisive instructions to Longo, who commanded the armed struggle waged by the Garibaldi units: "You must oppose all attempts at spoiling the uprising against the occupation forces" (L. Longo. "I centri dirigenti del PCI nella Resistenza" [The Leading Centers of the ICP in the Resistance]. Rome, 1973, p 505).

The 25 April 1945 national uprising which flared up on the initiative of the communists and with the decisive participation of the working class, resulted in the final liberation of all of Italy. More than 220,000 guerrillas, including 142,000 members of the Garibaldi units, took part in the final battles.

Equally interesting are passages in Togliatti's biography covering the postwar period. They show his tremendous efforts to create a mass communist party capable of heading the struggle of the working people for peace, democracy and socialism.

The powerful antifascist front which developed around the communist party during the Resistance toiled after the war for a democratic order in the country. Had the working class been able at that time to seize the real levers of political power and make radical changes in the interest of the tremendous majority of the working people the results would have helped to promote a fast change toward socialism, Togliatti wrote. However, Italy was occupied by Anglo-American troops and the material superiority of forces was not favorable to democracy (see P. Togliatti, "Rech' v Uchreditel'nom Sobranii" [Speeches in the Constituent Assembly]. Moscow, 1959, p 6).

Under these circumstances the Italian communists formulated a political line which made it possible to play on the relatively peaceful grounds of democratic activities the leading role which they had held during the guerrilla war. This course was based on the Leninist principle of using representative institutions in the struggle for a socialist revolution and took into consideration the national traditions of the Italian people. It was aimed at the maximal

development of class actions and the leadership of the toiling masses by the working class.

During the postwar period the battles waged by the Italian working people occasionally involved bloodshed and casualties, mass arrests and repressions. One of the most dramatic events in this struggle, as the authors indicate, was the armed attempt on Togliatti's life on 14 July 1948. This criminal action against the leader of the ICP took place at an exceptionally crucial time, when the Italian ruling circles had taken a sharp turn in their foreign and domestic policies. The Italian communists courageously fought attempts to turn the country into a U. S. satellite. In his 10 July 1948 speech in parliament, Togliatti described the Marshall Plan as a plan of economic preparations for a new imperialist war. This was the immediate cause for the assassination attempt. In reading these passages one unwittingly thinks of sinister events in recent Italian history involving political terrorism.

The struggle against the threat of war always played an important role in Togliatti's activities. Many parts in the book describe his efforts to prevent Italy from joining NATO. This task became one of Togliatti's major projects during the final decade of his life. Referring to the theoretical stipulations of the 20th CPSU Congress and the international communist conferences in 1957 and 1960 on the possibility of preventing another world war, Togliatti emphasized the prime importance of the struggle for peace and detente to the working class. In his objection to attempts to justify Italy's membership in NATO by citing the need for "defense," Togliatti pointed out that no one had been threatening Italy since the end of World War II. "It is necessary above all," Togliatti emphasized, "for the Italian people to be free from the most heavy burden of the location of bases for offensive nuclear weapons on our territory" (P. Togliatti, "Izbr. Stat'i i Rech'i," vol II, p 777).

On the basis of a principle-minded class approach in assessing problems of global policy, in his speeches in parliament and numerous articles Togliatti made uncompromising assessments of NATO as an aggressive military bloc created by U. S. imperialism as a weapon in the struggle not only against the socialist countries but the democratic forces elsewhere in the world, against the communist movement in particular.

Togliatti considered the struggle for the prevention of thermonuclear war as inseparately related to the unification of the international communist and worker movements. He feared and firmly opposed dissident actions aimed at undermining the unity of the world socialist forces and the international communist movement.

Although supporting the autonomy of communist parties Togliatti also saw the negative sides of such autonomy. He believed that it could "even constitute a serious threat." Pointing out that it would be wrong to deny this, Togliatti wrote in RINASCITA, the ICP theoretical and political journal, in 1961, that "This means above all the danger of isolation, of the individual parties locking themselves within themselves in a state of blind provincialism. This provincialism may have a number of manifestations: a weakening of the international spirit, lack of understanding or underestimating the tasks of agitation and struggle, which are directly related to the international



situation and the struggle against imperialism and for peaceful coexistence and peace; a particular form, such as arrogance, which may lead someone to consider himself the center of the universe and to assume that he has a mission to subject to superficial criticism the other segments of the movement, making no effort to become deeply familiar with their development conditions" (ibid., p 661).

Togliatti believed that this menace could be fought and avoided by raising each party in a spirit of internationalism, developing contacts with other parties, exchanging experience and freely discussing common problems.

Togliatti's critical spirit and creative search for the best, the optimal ways in the struggle for socialism in Italy never detracted from the main feature -- a class approach to all political problems.

In substantiating the need for fulfilling the tasks for the struggle shared by the entire labor movement and all communist parties, based on the main content of our times, Togliatti emphasized that without this "we would shift from autonomy to disorder, confusion and embarrassment." The formulation by the communist parties of joint initiatives and decisions on problems affecting the entire work and the revolutionary process as a whole does not infringe on the independence of the national revolutionary units in the least. "One must be able to combine," Togliatti said, "the independent development of each party with maximal solidarity and unity of our entire movement..." (ibid., p 115).

In formulating the strategy of the struggle for socialist reconstruction as applicable to Italy, in accordance with the new conditions which had developed after World War II, Togliatti invariably emphasized the universal validity of the most important stipulations of Marxist-Leninist theory confirmed by the revolutionary practice of many detachments of the workers movement. His name is linked to the revolutionary and internationalist traditions of the history of the Italian Communist Party.

It would be difficult to overestimate Togliatti's role in introducing Marxism in the social thinking of postwar Italy as the most vital and powerful ideological current. Togliatti found daily confirmation of the universality and significance of Marxism in comprehensive revolutionary practice and, above all, in the creation of a new society free from exploitation in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, based on the conscious application of scientific theory. Marxist theory proved, he wrote, "that it is a reliable leader not only in the study of reality but in the actual establishment of a new economic and social system" (P. Togliatti, "The ICP," p 113).

Although he considered the sharpness of discussions related to Marxism a confirmation of its tremendous influence in the liberation movement ("today there is no single bourgeois thinker who would be unwilling to argue with Marxism," Togliatti noted), the leader of the Italian communists firmly and on the basis of consistent class positions exposed any distortions of the essence of revolutionary theory and Marxism-Leninism.

Denying the link between the views of Marx and Lenin, and going as far as absurdly contrasting their views on the basic problems of the class struggle,



became one of the most refined methods used since the end of the 1950s by the supporters of the various currents of bourgeois and socioreformist thinking. Artificially breaking up the integrity of Marxism-Leninism as a continuously developing theory and high-level synthesis of revolutionary thought and action, the bearers of such views, ignoring obvious facts, set themselves the goal to prove that Lenin dealt with a situation prevailing in a "peripheral," "precapitalist country," for which reason the "model" of the Soviet revolution could not be applied in the developed capitalist countries. This concealed a trend which not only consciously belittled the universal historical significance of the Great October Revolution, which had inaugurated a new era for mankind, but also Lenin, as the leader of the world proletariat, and which instilled in the working people the false idea that the worker movement in the developed capitalist area had no effective guideline for socialist change, for which reason it could achieve only partial, albeit important, successes within the framework of the capitalist system. Such claims, which the power of the rich welcomed, for they led to the ideological disarmament of the working class and deprived its current struggle of a future, were firmly opposed by Togliatti. In his theoretical writings and speeches to the Italian workers and working people he graphically described the various aspects of Lenin's contribution to the development of revolutionary Marxism, emphasizing, in particular, that Lenin was able to link more perspicaciously than anyone else the theoretical analysis of imperialism with political conclusions.

Togliatti pointed out that Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence, which is the base of Soviet foreign policy, the theories of imperialism, the state and the proletarian revolution and the tactic of the united front of the working class he developed in 1921-1922, applicable to Western Europe specifically, proved the integral and universal nature of Leninism. Gramsci heavily relied on these Leninist ideas which had retained their full relevance in concretizing his concept of progress toward socialism in an industrially developed capitalist country. "It would be extremely stupid," Togliatti wrote, "to ignore Lenin's brilliant discoveries and statements which develop and deepen Marxist theory. At the beginning of the 20th century Lenin was the only philosopher who predicted most accurately the development of historical events in subsequent decades and to this day. His theory of imperialism and the proletarian revolution cover all contemporary philosophical problems" (P. Togliatti, "The ICP," pp 113-114).

The concept of the struggle for socialism under contemporary Italian conditions developed by Togliatti clearly prove his strictly scientific, daring yet cautious search for a substantiated strategy within the framework of the Marxist-Leninist formulation of the problem of the general and the specific and the international and the national.

According to Togliatti, two interrelated factors were the most important prerequisite for the successful implementation of this strategy:

Loyalty to the basic Marxist-Leninist principles, which are the laws governing the development of socialism and are mandatory to all worker parties in favor of overthrowing the capitalist system. "In whatever country or part of the world they may be, parties and peoples cannot take even the smallest step toward socialism were they to reject these principles. They may claim to be

"socialist," but actually the only thing such pseudosocialist parties have been able to accomplish has been to run bourgeois society in the interests of capitalism" (P. Togliatti, "Selected Speeches and Articles," vol II, p 98).

Consideration of the radical changes in the global ratio of sociopolitical forces in favor of socialism, changes achieved through the selfless labor and struggle of millions of people, headed by the vanguard of the working class. "What we are accomplishing today," Togliatti noted, referring to the international situation, which had become more favorable in terms of the struggle of the Italian working people as a result of the creation of the world socialist system, "would have been impossible and faulty 30 years ago. It would have been pure opportunism, as we said at that time. This must be clearly pointed out, for it helps the working class and working people to realize the seriousness of our party and understand the significance of the very stubborn fight which was waged in the past and which was effective because it followed essentially correct lines, although with occasional errors" (ibid., p 896).

The scale and range of Togliatti's interests were striking. He was thoroughly acquainted with history, philosophy and jurisprudence. He liked literature, art, medicine and botany, and spoke several foreign languages fluently. The readers will find interesting Togliatti's views on the beauty of Smolensk, which, like Stendahl, he compared to Florence.

The readers will also find many vivid examples showing Togliatti's political and general features such as endurance, persistence and faith in the triumph of the great objective he served. He was distinguished by exceptional work stamina, discipline and clarity of thought, tremendous exigency toward himself, ability to assess circumstances soberly, a spirit of initiative and purposefulness of action.

Togliatti had a special way of addressing himself to the working people. He spoke calmly, intimately, as though addressing each individual separately. This was the reason for his tireless desire for clarity and accessibility of speech. However, he never tried to oversimplify his thoughts. On the contrary, he always aspired to share with the audience the full meaning of his statements. The book describes him as an experienced educator and political teacher of the young Italian communist cadres.

The work has the unquestionable merit that its authors have been able to describe Togliatti's life and activities in close connection with the struggle waged by the communist party and the history of the Italian working class and nation. They depict the historical background with great skill, thus proving their extensive knowledge of Italian history and their closeness to the subject. The authors have visited Italy frequently and at length. They knew many communists personally, heard Togliatti speak and on numerous occasions they rely on their own recollections and observations. This makes the work trustworthy and creates a feeling of participation in the described events.

The book vividly recreates the great combat career of Togliatti, who dedicated his life to the ideals of the toiling people. He was a sincere and loyal friend of the Soviet Union and was perfectly familiar with our country's culture and achievements and was fluent in Russian. He frequently visited the

USSR, headed the ICP delegations to the 20th, 21st and 22nd CPSU Congresses and participated in the 1957 Conference of Representatives of Communist and Worker Parties. The contacts and relations between the ICP, Togliatti wrote, and the party of the Russian communists and the other communist and worker parties in power in a number of countries are of "positive significance to the entire Italian people, who draw from them experience, incentives and help in their own efforts aimed at becoming the masters of their own fate and earn tranquility and a peaceful future" (P. Togliatti, "The ICP," pp 110-111).

It was to this noble objective that Palmiro Togliatti dedicated his entire outstanding life.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## REALISTIC PROGRAM FOR CURBING THE ARMS RACE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 101-113

[Article by A. Chernyshev]

[Text] The complexity and aggravation of the present international situation were the result, as we know, of the actions of the aggressive imperialist circles, in Washington first of all, who intend to destroy the existing balance of forces between the Soviet Union and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, to gain military superiority, and to subordinate the course of world events to their will. Such actions directly threaten the peace, particularly in relation to the fact that Washington is relying on a spiralling arms race, nuclear above all, and is stating quite openly that American military doctrine does not exclude the possibility of it being the first to use them. Correspondingly, a nuclear war is declared "acceptable" and, in some circumstances, even expedient. Ignoring the unavoidable fact that the inevitable result of any use of nuclear weapons would be a global conflict with catastrophic consequences for mankind and for all life on earth and that should a nuclear conflict break out there would be no winner, the United States is developing various means for waging nuclear war, from quick to "protracted" and from "limited" to global, and is engaged in practical preparations for such a war which it intends to win.

The arms race in which the United States and NATO have engaged for the sake of gaining military superiority, an idee fixe in Washington, extends not only to nuclear but all other arms as well.

### I

As it has done in the past, Washington is trying to conceal its course of unprecedented increase in American military potential behind big talk to the effect that the United States performs in the world arena some sort of almost providential peace-making mission and that its transformation into the strongest military power is allegedly necessary in order to safeguard international security. This is paralleled by the intensive exploitation of the old threadbare and totally false thesis of the "Soviet threat." For example, using coarsest misrepresentations and naked fraud, efforts are being made to prove that it is not the United States but the Soviet Union which has always initiated arms races.



However, as everyone knows, it is precisely the United States which was the first to create a nuclear weapon and which remains the only country ever to use it as it did on the civilian population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Starting with the first postwar years, the United States plunged in a feverish nuclear arms race in the 1950s and 1960s: an armada of strategic bombers was created, the mass production of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) was organized and missile-carrying submarines were built. By 1966-1967 the United States had deployed more than 1,000 land-based ICBM and 41 nuclear-powered submarines carrying 656 ballistic missiles aboard. At that time the USSR had slightly more than 600 strategic missiles and no nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarines.

Nor can claims that in the 1970s the United States was practicing "restraint" in strategic and other armaments withstand criticism. Thus, the Minuteman-1 were replaced with 550 Minuteman-3 missiles with three independently targeted warheads each. The power of the warheads was increased and the missiles were equipped with teleguidance retargeting systems; 496 Poseidon S-3, each carrying 10-14 warheads, were installed on 31 nuclear submarines. The submarines were also armed with Polaris A-3 missiles with improved accuracy independently targeted warheads; almost 270 heavy bombers were equipped with 20 medium-range missiles each. During the past decades the U. S. armed forces were supplied with an average of three nuclear charges daily. The current number of nuclear charges in the U. S. strategic arsenal totals more than 10,000 and is expected to reach 20,000.

The so-called theater nuclear weapons were updated as well, consisting of many hundreds of means of delivery which the United States is deploying around the USSR and its allies. This includes nuclear-missile carrying airplanes, based in a number of European countries, aboard American aircraft carriers in seas adjacent to Europe, etc. Conventionally, said means of delivery are considered as medium range. Essentially, however, they have been given the function of strategic weapons, since by virtue of their geographic location or mobility they can strike targets deep inside Soviet territory.

The present American administration is calling for the deployment of 100 latest-model MX intercontinental ballistic missiles, armed with 10 warheads each, with each warhead packing more power than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima by a factor of 30. The U. S. Navy is being supplied with nuclear submarines armed with Trident-1 missiles; plans call for arming missile-carrying, including the latest "Ohio"-class submarines with the even more powerful and accurate Trident-2 missiles. The mass production of the new B-1B strategic bombers will be undertaken and work will be continued on the development of the Stealth bomber, which is specially equipped to breach antiaircraft defenses. The implementation of plans for the deployment of more than 12,000 air-, sea- and land-based long-range cruise missiles has been undertaken. Washington has also taken a course of deploying some 600 new American Pershing-2 medium-range nuclear and cruise missiles which, once installed, will directly add to the American strategic potential. Wide-ranging measures to develop qualitatively new systems of conventional weapons have been announced, thus adding another dimension to the arms race. Let us also not ignore the fact that the United States was the first to undertake the production and stockpiling of neutron and binary chemical weapons.

Furthermore, the United States, which was the first to develop some 30 new weapons systems since the end of the world war, is currently developing many types of weapons based on the latest scientific achievements, including systems and facilities for combat in and from outer space.

Reagan recently declared that the United States will undertake the development of a broad-range highly efficient antimissile defense. Under circumstances in which the development and improvement of U. S. strategic offensive forces is continuing at full speed, with a view to acquiring the potential to deal a first nuclear strike, the purpose of acquiring the possibility of destroying with the help of such defenses the respective strategic arms of the other side and thus to deprive it of the possibility of a retaliatory strike is to disarm the Soviet Union in the face of the American nuclear threat. In their time, however, the USSR and the United States had recognized and included in the 1972 treaty on limiting antiballistic missile systems (IBM), and in a provisional agreement on certain measures in the area of limiting strategic weapons (SALT I) the fact that only reciprocal restraint in antimissile defense would make progress possible in limiting and reducing offensive armaments, i.e., restraining and turning back the overall strategic arms race. Now Washington would like to break this unbreakable interconnection. Undoubtedly, were the result of such a "new defense concept" to be implemented, the result would be to open the door to an unrestrained race involving both offensive and defensive strategic weapons.

Therefore, the steady growth and improvement of American strategic and other armaments over decades, Reagan's new "strategic program" for the 1980s and Washington's aspiration to deploy medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe at all cost, along with many other facts irrefutably prove that it is the United States which has been and remains the instigator of the arms race. Another weighty argument to this effect is the fact that Washington has either rejected or left without constructive answer one Soviet suggestion after another on limiting armaments and disarmament. Suffice it to mention the fact that the United States refuses to follow the example of the Soviet Union in assuming the obligation not to use nuclear weapons first. The United States has also refused to ratify the SALT II Treaty and is not resuming talks on a total ban on nuclear tests and an agreement not to place any weapons in outer space. The list could be extended.

In the face of the challenge which the United States has hurled at our country throughout the postwar era, the Soviet Union was forced to take measures to maintain its defense potential on the necessary level. Let us particularly emphasize in this connection that the USSR did only what was strictly necessary to prevent it from falling behind in the vitally important area of ensuring the security of real socialism and eliminating American military superiority. It has never aimed at achieving military superiority, for this conflicts with the ideological foundations of our society.

"The military-strategic parity which has been reached," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary emphasized, "deprived the United States of the possibility of blackmailing us with the nuclear threat. This parity is a reliable guarantee for peace and we shall do everything possible to preserve it."

## II

To those aware of the real situation to claim, as Washington does, that there is presently no approximate parity of forces between the USSR and the United States or between the Warsaw Pact and NATO means deliberately to ignore all realism in assessing the current situation and deliberately to mislead domestic and international public opinion. Incidentally, it was only after the Reagan administration took over in 1981 that the American side began to deny the existence of a balance in Soviet and U. S. strategic armaments, a balance which had been thoroughly established in the course of the long SALT II discussions and confirmed by the heads of the two countries at its initialing in 1979. The following question legitimately arises: Could something which would change the situation in the field of strategic armaments in favor of the Soviet Union have occurred in less than 2 years? Naturally, it could not. Even Washington does not dare openly to challenge the fact that our country is observing the stipulations of SALT II although the American side frequently is not ashamed at resorting to unconscientious hints to the opposite, in order to encourage doubts regarding the position of the USSR on this matter.

The situation which has developed with SALT II is characterized by the fact that, as it was not ratified by the fault of Washington, the countries which initialed it are not legally bound by it. So far, however, both the USSR and the United States have in general honored its stipulations.

The Soviet Union, which will continue to support the provisions of SALT II providing, naturally, that the United States does the same, is convinced that the treaty, which was a major accomplishment in the area of limiting and reducing strategic armaments, could provide a good base for taking further steps in the same direction, directly related to the main problem facing current international life -- the problem of war and peace.

Occasionally, American official spokesmen make statements in the sense that the U. S. government is observing the provisions of SALT II but in a way that makes clear Washington's intention to honor the treaty only as long as it does not hinder the implementation of the American programs for increasing nuclear armaments.

The accurate assessment of the military strength of the sides based on non-nuclear armaments we should compare the forces and facilities of both the USSR and the United States and the two alliances as a whole -- the Warsaw Pact and NATO. This would prove the rough parity between them in terms of the ratio of forces in medium-range nuclear armaments deployed in Europe: Each side has about 1,000 launchers, although it is important to note that in terms of the overall number of nuclear warheads NATO enjoys a 50 percent superiority.

Soviet missiles code-named in the West SS-4, SS-5 and SS-20, and medium-range bombers are countering on the European continent the mentioned American theater weapons, British and French medium-ranged land- and sea-based ballistic missiles and their corresponding model bombers. That is why the efforts which Washington and those who follow in the fairway of its militaristic policy are making to compare the forces of the two sides only in terms of USSR and U. S. land-based medium-range missiles are absurd.



Bearing in mind the existing balance in medium-range nuclear missiles, as we know the Soviet Union unilaterally proclaimed and is strictly observing a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles on the European part of its territory, and is even reducing the number of such missiles further.

The balance of forces between the two sides is clear also in terms of the basic indicators related to conventional weapons. NATO is superior to the Warsaw Pact in overall size of armed forces, number of combat-ready divisions and antitank weapons; it is roughly of equal strength in artillery and tanks and is somewhat inferior to the Warsaw Pact forces in the number of tactical aircraft. "Therefore," notes D. F. Ustinov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of defense, "if we objectively assess the ratio between Warsaw Pact and NATO military strength we should acknowledge that in terms of strategic nuclear weapons, medium-range strategic missiles deployed in Europe or conventional NATO and Warsaw Pact armed forces, approximate parity exists in all these cases."

### III

Driven by imperial ambitions and striving for world leadership, Washington needs not parity but military superiority, from the positions of which it would like to ensure the solution of international problems which affect it to its advantage. Current U. S. plans on the intensification of the nuclear arms race are aimed at achieving superiority by no later than 1990, as conceived by the White House. However, such aggressive plans are doomed to failure from the start. They will frighten neither the USSR nor its allies, who are drawing proper conclusions from a possible increase in the real threat to their security. If necessary, the Soviet Union will be able to meet Washington's challenge efficiently and promptly, even if it has to develop corresponding weapon systems, although our country has no intention whatsoever to emulate the United States or to hasten to follow it whenever a new weapon system is created. In a word, the USSR and the members of the Warsaw Pact can block any militaristic steps undertaken by the United States and NATO.

At the same time, true to its peaceful course, the Soviet Union has neither desired nor desires world events to pursue a course of military rivalry. Acting as a consistent and firm opponent of such rivalry, it urgently calls upon the United States to put an end to efforts to disturb the existing balance of forces and to stop weakening the foundations of international security, while most convincingly demonstrating its readiness for mutually acceptable solutions.

Washington's hopes that as it implements new programs for increasing armaments it would be able to persuade the USSR to make unilateral concessions and to abandon its principled line on ending the arms race and disarmament, particularly at the Geneva Soviet-American talks on limiting and reducing strategic armaments and limiting nuclear arms in Europe, are absolutely groundless. "We," Comrade Yu. V. Andropov points out, "are in favor of searching for a truly firm solution to the most difficult problems, naturally, most of all that of restraining the race in nuclear and conventional arms, acceptable to both sides. But let no one expect of us unilateral disarmament. We are not naive. We do not ask of the West a unilateral disarmament. We favor equality,



a consideration of the interests of both sides and an honest agreement. For this we are ready."

As it has repeatedly stressed, the Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that the principles of equality and identical security are of basic importance in resolving problems related to limiting the arms race and disarmament. This principle, which is the foundation of the Soviet position at international bilateral and multilateral gatherings is dictated by historical experience and the circumstances of the nuclear age. It reflects the obvious fact that no contracting party would sign an agreement which would endanger its security. This means that the countries participating in the talks must not try to achieve superiority over the others but to maintain and safeguard parity on the lowest possible level. Life itself clearly proves that it is only on the basis of the strict observance of this principle that objective and subjective difficulties in such a complex problem affecting the very essence of national security as limiting nuclear armaments can be resolved.

The Soviet Union, which has consistently favored lifting the threat of nuclear war, and treating its outbreak a most heinous crime against mankind, is ready to adopt even the most radical measures to limit and reduce nuclear weapons, including their total elimination, based on the principles of equality and identical security.

The United States has adopted a different violently negative approach to problems of nuclear disarmament. It has taken a line of undermining existing agreements and all indications exist that it does not aim at reaching new agreements. The danger which this approach represents to the interests of all nations, the American included, is obvious. "The sooner the U. S. administration returns to reality," A. A. Gromyko CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, emphasized, "and realizes that agreements on limiting and reducing nuclear armaments are as necessary to the United States as they are to the Soviet Union, the faster progress will be achieved in resolving such problems of vital importance to all mankind."

#### IV

One of the main ways to eliminate the danger of a nuclear war is to reach an agreement on limiting and reducing strategic armaments (START). The USSR takes a most serious attitude toward such talks and calls for drafting a just and mutually acceptable agreement which, while strictly and fully embodying the principles of equality and identical security, would strengthen the security of the Soviet Union and the United States while considerably reducing the level of the approximate parity of their strategic forces.

The proposals made by our country call for the gradual reduction in the overall number of ICBM, ballistic missiles aboard submarines and heavy bomber to 1,800 units per side by 1990, i.e., a 25 percent lowering of the initial ceiling set by the SALT II Treaty. This will mean a reduction in the number of all strategic launchers without exception by several hundred units. The number of nuclear warheads they carry would be substantially reduced as well by an equal mutually agreed upon figure. The Soviet proposals would plug all

channels for a continued strategic arms race: the deployment of long-range cruise missiles (range in excess of 600 km), wherever based, and other new strategic arms would be banned and possibilities to improve on existing strategic armaments would be maximally curtailed. Naturally, such restrictions and limitations would be subject to proper verification. The stipulation that at all reduction stages the USSR and the United States would be in an equal position in terms of ensuring their safety and the preservation of parity in their strategic potential would be of essential importance.

In order to end immediately the race in the growth of strategic weapons and to ensure favorable conditions for successful progress of the Geneva talks, the USSR suggests that as long as the talks last both Soviet and American strategic arsenals be frozen. After agreement has been reached in these talks, it is ready to go even further -- to a more extensive mutual reduction in the number of said weapons, to which the parties could agree on the basis of the overall strategic world situation.

The Soviet Union has also made a number of other proposals calling for reaching an agreement within the framework of the future accord on efficient measures which would not simply register but would impose major limitations in preventing crisis situations and increasing trust between the USSR and the United States, with a view to improving their stability. This would include a ban on the flight of heavy bombers and sailing of aircraft carriers of both sides inside agreed-upon areas adjacent to the territory of the other side; advance notification to the other side of a mass take-off of heavy bombers and theater zone aircraft; demarcation of areas inside which no antisubmarine activities on the part of the other side would be allowed.

With a view to facilitating the work on drafting the final agreement the Soviet delegation submitted at the talks a draft "Foundation for an Agreement Between the USSR and the United States on the Limitation and Reduction of Strategic Armaments," which is a concise presentation of concepts which could become the backbone of such an agreement.

The results of the previous two and the current third rounds of Soviet-American START talks indicate that Washington, which delayed the opening of such talks for a long time, is entering them from positions which are openly directed not at preserving strategic parity but at ensuring for itself advantages to the detriment of Soviet security and in the interest of gaining military superiority. It supports not a termination of the strategic arms race but its continuation; including opening new channels, and not lowering but raising the level of nuclear confrontation. The line taken by the American side at the talks is aimed at imposing the type of solutions in START according to which the USSR would have to destroy most of its IBM, which are the base of Soviet strategic might, as well as break up and reorganize in accordance with American standards the entire structure of its strategic forces, allowing the United States complete freedom to carry out all of its military programs. The adoption of Washington's suggestion could give the United States double superiority in the number of IBM and submarine-launched missiles and an even greater advantage in terms of the overall number of nuclear charges on all strategic launchers. These proposals would not only permit the United States sharply to increase its number of warheads but even

to raise the number of launchers beyond the officially set limits, above all by extensively developing American long-range cruise missiles. The Soviet Union would find itself at a disadvantage also in terms of strategic bombers.

The United States is also persistently trying to avoid a truly equitable comprehensive approach suggested by the Soviet side, which would open the shortest way to an equal START agreement. It is also rejecting the Soviet proposal to freeze strategic weapons and to limit the development of missile-carrying submarines such as the American Ohio class and similar Soviet models. Persistent attempts are being made to include in the strategic armaments the TU-22M (Backfire) medium-range Soviet bomber. Furthermore, the Reagan administration, which claims to support steps aimed at reducing the threat of the outbreak of a crisis situation, and is essentially not reluctant to replace the solution of problems of limiting and restricting nuclear armaments with such measures, is nevertheless rejecting without any serious reasons the Soviet initiatives on the adoption of far-reaching and broad measures or else tries to promote its substantially narrower proposals in connection with the Soviet ones. The U. S. delegation has also been unwilling to discuss seriously a draft document submitted by the Soviet delegation on the foundations of a Soviet-American START agreement.

Clearly, the standstill at the strategic armament talks is entirely the fault of Washington. The one-sided selective approach taken by the American side in the talks is a plan for the unilateral disarmament of the USSR and the restoration of former U. S. strategic superiority. Such an approach excludes the possibility of reaching a mutually acceptable START agreement.

Such an agreement can become reality only if we consider that the strategic forces of the Soviet Union and the United States are substantially different in their structure, since for several decades they developed along different ways under the influence of the specific military-political circumstances which prevailed during specific time periods, the characteristics of the geographic and strategic positions of the sides, the technological decisions they had adopted, etc. This precisely is what explains the fact that the United States has traditionally relied more on strategic aviation and submarines, while the USSR has long preferred ground-based intercontinental missiles. Correspondingly, 80 percent of the American strategic potential consists of heavy bombers and missile-carrying submarines, while 70 percent of the Soviets', in terms of warheads, consists of ground-based ICBM. Consequently, a just agreement should include all parts of the strategic armament complex and take into consideration all factors which influence the strategic situation. It should be based on maintaining parity in the ratio of forces and the identical security of both sides. Such is the base of our position. A constructive U. S. response to it would contribute to the success of the START talks. So far, however, no such response has been made. Procedural proposals and showy details and refining of individual elements in the U. S. approach do not make such a position any more suitable as a basis for an agreement.

## V

In pursuing its course of disturbing the European and global balance to its advantage and ensuring NATO's clear superiority over the Warsaw Pact, for



quite some time Washington has been blocking Soviet-American talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. Its initial position, expressed in the proposal formulated at the talks of the so-called "zero option," calls for the removal of all Soviet medium-range missiles not only on the European but also the Asian part of the USSR. At the same time, the United States and the other NATO countries would not lose a single missile or airplane, and would even be able to increase their nuclear armaments. As a result of the implementation of the "zero option" the present equality in the number of medium-range launchers on the European Continent and the 50 percent NATO superiority in nuclear charges would end up giving NATO a double superiority in launchers and a triple superiority in charges.

In supporting this position with the help of fabricated reasons and arguments, the American side mentions, for example, some sort of Soviet "missile monopoly" in Europe. If we were to believe this, we would ignore the existence of more than 160 ballistic missiles owned by Britain and France, who are the NATO allies of the United States. Washington also claims that the "zero option" is aimed at the elimination of "all types of medium-range ground-based missiles." However, no elimination whatsoever is contemplated, for the purpose is to remove all Soviet missiles while retaining all British and French ones. Furthermore, the class of medium range missiles itself includes more than missiles. It includes the airplanes which the Reagan administration would rather not mention.

The efforts to avoid the question of British and French nuclear weapons by citing their non-participation in the Geneva talks and the "special" nature of their nuclear arsenals appear illogical, to say the least. How can we ignore the fact that these countries account today for more than one quarter of the total number of medium-range nuclear missiles NATO has in Europe? Nor is there any doubt as to the side on which the British and French nuclear weapons are, for both British and French official policy has always considered their armed forces part of the military power of the North Atlantic Alliance. That is why said weapons must be unconditionally included as a factual figure in the balance which would be agreed upon in a Soviet-American treaty on reducing and limiting nuclear armaments on the European Continent.

The stubbornness with which the United States refuses to include the British and French nuclear weapons, reducing everything to the Soviet and American ones, reflects its aspiration to impose an uneven treaty on the USSR, something to which, naturally, the latter will never agree. Any agreement on medium-range nuclear weapons must be based on the strict consideration of existing reality and maintaining the balance of forces which has developed over decades and is defined by the fact that in the eastern part of Europe the Soviet Union is the sole nuclear power, whereas in the West, in addition to the United States, so are Britain and France.

Washington cannot be unaware of the fact that our country will not agree to a unilateral disarmament and that the Warsaw Pact will not allow NATO to gain superiority. The conclusion is evident: by proposing a clearly unacceptable "zero option" the Reagan administration's objective is not to reach an agreement in Geneva but to deploy new American missiles in Europe.



The false nature of the "zero option" and its lack of future have gradually become apparent also to NATO countries. They are beginning to realize that the United States is participating in the Geneva talks in order to distract the attention and that by describing the situation at the talks in a rosy light its purpose is to calm down public opinion, in Western Europe above all, which is profoundly concerned with whether the problem of nuclear armaments in Europe will be resolved or the arms race continued even more extensively. Washington is finding it noticeably harder to defend its "zero" option. The tour of the capitals of U. S. NATO allies which U. S. Vice President Bush made recently did not contribute to the promotion of this concept.

The "interim solution" announced by Reagan in his 30 March statement, which essentially calls for having an equal number of nuclear warheads for medium-range missiles, is advertised as a conscious manifestation of the flexibility shown by the American side. It is being emphasized that Washington considers this "solution" a step on the way to reaching its final objective -- the "zero option." The present "variant" and the announced "principles" which define the U. S. position at the Geneva talks in fact do not stipulate equal levels in NATO and Warsaw Pact medium-range nuclear weapons for Europe, for they again ignore the existing French and British nuclear weapons and American theater aircraft. Furthermore, once again the groundless demand to reduce Soviet medium-range missiles not only in the European but also the Asian part of the USSR is raised. Again this implies a unilateral reduction of armaments on the part of the Soviet Union. All in all, today it is even clearer that Washington's objective is to deploy new American missiles in Europe.

In a certain sense the "interim solution" reveals an even more intransigent approach compared with the "zero option," and lays no grounds for a just agreement. Nor can said "principles" be taken as criteria in a future agreement, for they clash with the principles of equality and equal security.

Equally noteworthy is the whipped-up thesis in Washington and some other NATO capitals, according to which even after the deployment of American missiles has begun the U. S.-Soviet Geneva talks could go on as though nothing extraordinary had happened. This should mislead no one. The deployment of the missiles would create a qualitatively new situation and the full responsibility for its consequences would fall on the United States and NATO as a whole. The Soviet Union has frequently stated that it would be forced to react suitably to the appearance of such missiles in Western Europe. It is equally necessary to underscore the illusory nature of the hopes that the threat of the deployment of such missiles would force the USSR into unilateral concessions at the Geneva talks. With such deployment the American side would blast the very grounds for such talks.

Our country is willing to reach a solution to the problem of nuclear arms in Europe including a truly absolute "zero" -- the total elimination from the continent of nuclear medium-range and tactical weapons. In as much as Washington is pretending that no such Soviet proposal exists -- it does not dare to reject it openly or to accept it -- the USSR has proposed the following alternative: To scale down to a third nuclear medium-range weapons in Europe. The balance of forces in terms of medium-range missiles deployed in Europe would reach the zero level for the USSR and the United States and

the Soviet side would retain only a number equivalent to British and French missiles. The reduction would affect hundreds of Soviet missiles, including dozens of the most advanced SS-20 as they are known in the West. Therefore, the number of launching pads for Soviet medium-range missiles deployed in the European part of the USSR and the overall number of their warheads would be less than in 1976, i.e., before the Soviet Union began to update its medium-range missiles. Furthermore, should the number of British and French missiles drop in the future, the Soviet number would be reduced by the same amount. Naturally, agreement would also have to be reached on reducing to an even number medium-range missile-carrying airplanes on both sides in the European zone on the part of the USSR and NATO. At that point full equality would be achieved in terms of missiles and airplanes, on an incomparably lower level compared with the present.

It is worth noting that the principal means for reducing nuclear weapons suggested by the USSR is their destruction. At the same time, a certain number of weapons, as small as possible, could remain but deployed behind agreed-upon lines. Those who are today persistently calling for the destruction of all the missiles we withdraw should be asked what attitude should the Soviet Union take toward missiles deployed with no restrictions whatsoever in a number of Asian countries and in the waters washing Asian countries, for they include a number of weapons not covered by current agreements and would not be covered by an eventual agreement on nuclear arms in Europe. Clearly, the Soviet Union cannot ignore this fact.

Such is the principled position held by the Soviet Union in the talks with the United States. It was reflected in the expanded draft treaty submitted by the Soviet delegation and opens the way to resolving the problem of limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in the interest of the security of the peoples in Europe and beyond it. Objective possibilities for reaching a Soviet-American agreement in Geneva exist. However, the United States should adopt a responsible approach to the talks.

Let us also mention the fact that the Western European countries have no right to play the role of marginal observers in this case. Nor is their role as promoters of Washington's unconstructive and one-sided position seemly. They can and must speak out in favor of a just solution to the problem of limiting and reducing nuclear armaments and, consequently, in favor of peace in Europe and throughout the world. They should not be distracted by frequent statements to the effect that such actions undermine their solidarity with the United States and NATO unity and play in the hands of the Soviet Union. The purpose of such unconscientious blabberings is to draw the attention away from the egotistical and unpromising line followed by the Reagan administration at the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks. The eventual consequences of this line should become the particular concern precisely on the part of those who are lightheartedly willing to let American missiles enter their homes, essentially putting themselves in the position of Washington's nuclear hostages.

## VI

Unquestionably, reaching an agreement at the Vienna talks on reducing the size of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe would be also of

unquestionable importance. For the past 10 years they have been unable to advance due to the positions held by the Western partners, who have engaged in sterile discussions in questioning the figures submitted by the socialist countries on the size of Warsaw Pact forces which, compared with the size of NATO forces, prove the existence of a rough parity between the forces of the two military alliances in Europe. Claiming without justification that the ground forces of the Warsaw Pact in this area are considerably larger and insisting on an uneven reduction of forces to the detriment of the Warsaw Pact by a factor of 3 compared with a reduction in their own forces, the Western partners in the Vienna talks are clearly avoiding their successful completion.

With a view to surmounting the "figure barrier" and pull the Vienna talks out of the doldrums, on behalf of the socialist countries directly involved in the talks, in February 1983 the USSR submitted new constructive proposals which call for reaching an agreement on reducing the NATO and Warsaw Pact forces in Central Europe to equal combined levels, regardless of the size of their forces. The parties themselves would determine the extent of reduction of their armed forces with a view to reaching overall parity. As a result of such reductions either side should not have in this area more than 900,000 men in their armed forces, including more than 700,000 infantry, i.e., they should have no forces in excess of the numbers on which agreement has been reached. Considering the simplicity and practicality of this approach, an agreement could be reached quite quickly this very year.

The proposal calls for a reciprocal reduction of Soviet and U. S. forces in Central Europe as an initial step in this direction, even prior to an agreement. In addition to the 20,000 servicemen already withdrawn from GDR territory on a unilateral basis, the Soviet Union would be prepared to withdraw another 20,000 during the year, providing that the United States would withdraw a total of 13,000 within the same period. Mutually acceptable verification possibilities should be agreed upon in terms of this specific step and in the case of more substantial reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact forces in the center of Europe. It is considered that after the reduction in Soviet and American forces, all direct participants in the Vienna talks would adopt reciprocal political obligations to freeze the levels of their armed forces and weapons in Central Europe until a final agreement has been reached.

The socialist countries expect of their Western partners to approach this new initiative most seriously and responsively and to show not only in words but in actions their political will to reach a just agreement.

Guided by the interests of reliably protecting security on the European continent and relieving it from nuclear weapons, the USSR and the other members of the Warsaw Pact are calling for the establishment of nuclear-free zones in Northern Europe and on the Balkans and turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation. The Swedish government's initiative which called for establishing in Europe a battlefield zone free from nuclear (i.e., tactical) weapons met with a positive Soviet response. However, the USSR expressed the view that in order for such a zone to be truly effective it should be 500-600 km wide and that it should start with Central Europe in the context of the efforts made at the Vienna talks on this subject and in which the Soviet Union would be willing to participate.



The socialist states are actively in favor of an agreement to hold a conference on measures of trust and disarmament in Europe, to be reached by the participants in the European conference at their Madrid meeting. They have also proposed that the members of the Warsaw Pact and NATO assume the obligation not to extend the spheres of action of the alliances to countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The initiative formulated at the Prague conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee on the reciprocal nonuse of military force and on maintaining peaceful relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries is a major step. The core of this action would be the mutual obligation assumed by said countries not to be the first to use nuclear or conventional weapons against the other side and, consequently, not to be the first to use military force against it in general. After the Soviet unilateral June 1982 obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, this is one more exceptionally fruitful display of good will on the part of the socialist comity. The NATO countries should treat it without prejudice and with suitable seriousness.

Bearing in mind today's particularly difficult international situation, it becomes particularly necessary to move ahead the question of a real limitation and reduction of armaments and armed forces, which is stuck at an empty run as a result of the openly militaristic course charted by the United States and NATO. A broad set of respective proposals was included in the Soviet memorandum on "Lifting the Growing Nuclear Threat and Restraining the Arms Race," which was submitted to the second special UN General Assembly on disarmament. This set of proposals was expanded and developed with the initiatives formulated by the USSR at the 37th UN General Assembly subsequently, and in a number of proposals contained in the Prague Political Declaration of Warsaw Pact members. The Soviet Union is consistently calling for the total and universal banning of nuclear tests, removing chemical weapons from the countries' arsenals, banning neutron and radiological weapons, nondeployment of weapons of any kind in outer space, limiting naval activities and, above all, reducing military budgets.

The policy pursued by the USSR on problems of preventing a nuclear war and restraining the arms race offers a practical opportunity for putting an end to today's dangerous development of events and resolving systematically problems of limiting and reducing armaments, nuclear above all. The Soviet Union is doing all it can for reason to triumph in international affairs. It will continue to struggle tirelessly for an end to the arms race and the safeguard and strengthening of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11



## MATERIAL PREREQUISITES FOR THE SOCIAL HOMOGENEITY OF THE SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 113-120

[Review by N. Moskovchenko, candidate of economic sciences, of the books (1) "Ekonomicheskiye Osnovy Sotsial'noy Odnorodnosti Obshchestva" [Economic Foundations of the Social Homogeneity of Society] by V. V. Tsakunov. Mysl', Moscow, 1982, 255 pages; (2) "Problemy Sotsialisticheskogo Obraza Zhizni" [Problems of the Socialist Way of Life]. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 200 pages; (3) "Effektivnost' Obobshchestvleniya Sotsialisticheskogo Truda" [Effectiveness of the Socialization of Socialist Labor] by V. M. Kuznetsov. Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 228 pages]

[Text] At the present stage improvements in the social structure of Soviet society on the way to the overall objective -- total communism -- are being made systematically, on the basis of a profound scientific analysis of economic and social processes, by the communist party, projections of detected trends in the development of production forces and elimination of class differences, and the formulation of sets of suitable steps in socioeconomic policy and their implementation, closely related to ideological and political-educational work. The stipulations and conclusions of the 26th party congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums are of essential significance to further studies in this area.

Philosophers, economists and sociologists are addressing themselves with increasing to one of them -- the concept according to which "a classless social structure will be established in its main and essential features within the historical boundaries of mature socialism." This assumption, which is an important element in the concept of developed socialism, is organically related to the other stipulations, two of which are worth singling out: First, at the present stage society resolves the problem of combining the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution; second, the economy is converted to intensive development, paralleled by changes in the material and technical base and in the forms of the social organization of production. As the study of a number of works confirms, taking these aspects into consideration, Soviet social scientists have undertaken the more comprehensive and specific study of the various aspects of development of the socioclass structure of Soviet society and the shaping of its social homogeneity.

The books under review cover a variety of aspects. In monograph (1) progress toward complete social homogeneity is considered as the result of the elimination of socioclass differences within the single system of production relations, based on the objective direction followed by developed socialist production toward general well-being and the comprehensive development of the individual. In the collective work (2), prepared by scientists at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and their GDR colleagues, problems of the elimination of a number of essential socioeconomic differences between workers engaged in primarily mental and physical work, between the rural and urban populations, and so on, are studied on the basis of their influence on strengthening the unified socialist way of life. The book (3) deals with a major economic problem -- the socialization of socialist labor. The process of shaping the capabilities of the worker of a new type, whose cultural and technical standards become the guideline and standard in the progress toward a classless social structure, is studied in detail as one of the prerequisites for improving efficiency in the nationwide cooperation of labor. In a word, this is a comprehensive study of the establishment of social homogeneity.

The authors of these publications base their studies on the fact that the material foundation for the systematic advancement of Soviet society toward full social homogeneity rests on the socialization of production in the broad meaning of the term, i.e., on the presumption that it covers productive capital, labor activeness and the management system. On the strictly production level socialization develops in three interacting forms -- specialization, cooperation and concentration -- and is based on the application of systems of highly efficient productive capital. The systematic concentration by society on the production of specific commodities at several specialized enterprises makes it possible to satisfy overall requirements with lesser labor, material and energy outlays compared with a different organization of the same process, since the production process is based on the use of homogenous equipment, which is the material embodiment of modern scientific knowledge.

Specialized shops technologically related to other production processes (passenger cars, refrigerators) may participate in meeting such requirements along with large enterprises. However, they must use equipment similar to that used at specialized enterprises and they must not be substantially different from the latter in terms of personnel structure, skill grade, and outlays of material and energy related to identical operations. Consequently, on the economic level socialization means working for all of society and meeting its requirements for specific goods by several production units and with roughly similar socially necessary costs. In this capacity it becomes the base for essential social changes due, first of all, to the fact that a homogenous material and technical production base requires a structurally homogenous manpower. This is expressed, in particular, through the availability of related skills. Secondly, it becomes technologically necessary to broaden the capabilities of the working individual, for this increases the variety of production facilities serviced by the worker and several old skills (general-purpose mechanizer, clearing miner, etc.) merge into a single new profession.

At the mature socialist stage the pace of production socialization -- a rather complex and contradictory process -- is accelerated in general, thanks to the optimized dimensions and specialization of the new enterprises and the

reconstruction of existing ones, the improvement of the intersectorial balance and so on. This fact is confirmed by the increased similarity between production scales and some indicators of economic management conditions in kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Whereas between 1966 and 1970 direct labor outlays per quintal of grain (excluding corn), cotton, potatoes and vegetables grown in the open and the increased weight of young cattle in the kolkhozes exceeded similar sovkhoz indicators, respectively, by 92, 22, 16, 92 and 48 percent, in the 10th Five-Year Plan the disparity declined to 27 percent for grain, 44 percent for vegetables and 29 for increased weight of cattle offspring; in potato growing kolkhoz labor outlays dropped below the sovkhoz level, and only in cotton growing did the disparity increase to 26 percent.

This rapprochement between the two agricultural production sectors in terms of labor is based on the intensified specialization of all farms and the increased availability of technical facilities in kolkhoz production despite an overall decrease. The differences among enterprises confirm the existence of reserves in the production socialization process under mature socialist conditions and the fact that the kolkhoz-cooperative form of ownership has not exhausted its possibilities. It is also obvious that socialization in agriculture is not developing identically along its entire front and that the primacy of the property of the whole people is retained. In this case sovkhoz production remains the ground on which society "tests" the use of new production facilities, forms of labor organization and wages and management systems before extending them to the entire sector.

The political economic content of this important material process which plays a leading role in the property of the whole people is studied in detail by V. V. Tsakunov. At the developed socialist stage the objective need to ensure the full satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people becomes also a direct target of economic policy on the basis of relations of nationwide ownership. This need can be satisfied, among others, as a result of the accelerated development of agriculture and the entire agroindustrial complex and the implementation of production processes (growing, harvesting, procuring, storing and processing commodities) within optimal agronomical and biological periods. This becomes possible above all thanks to the increased capital-labor ratio, the comprehensive mechanization of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the enhanced level of cadre vocational training. For example, whereas a worker in public farming averaged 8.5 hp in power equipment, the figure had reached 26.9 hp in 1981, i.e., it had more than tripled. Within the same period kolkhoz and sovkhoz productive capital in terms of productive and turnover assets had nearly tripled, from 36.6 to 113.5 billion rubles.

The increased volume of technological facilities for farm labor, based on comprehensive equipment and tool supplies, and supporting the sector with operational and repair workers enable society to reach the optimal scientifically set deadlines for carrying out production processes. Such intensification of production socialization improves management standards and, on the economic level, turns into increased output and improved population supplies. (Current gaps between the production of agricultural commodities and the dynamics of capital-labor ratios are the result of intrasectorial reasons and the imbalance within the agroindustrial complex.) On the other hand, the increased production of corresponding productive capital, based on the requirements



of the sector at large, enables society to lower production costs thanks to enterprise serialized and specialized output. On the scale of the economy, the increased use of the developed productive capital by kolkhozes and sovkhozes is the most productive.

Therefore, the leading role of the property of the whole people in the process of development of production relations consists of the creation and consolidation of material-technical and organizational prerequisites for reaching the supreme target in public production in the kolkhoz-cooperative sector. The use of new equipment and contemporary technological processes in the kolkhozes and their increased specialization based on scientific requirements stimulate, in turn, the reorganization of all elements in the kolkhoz way of life. The increased volume of agricultural production requires reliable transportation facilities for shipping goods out and bringing in fertilizers, mixed feeds, etc. Improvements in the material and technical production base and the use of new technological processes increase the objective need for upgrading the cultural and technological standards of the working people. This is achieved by improving the rural education system and making it consistent with the requirements of society at large. In other words, socialization is being increasingly extended to manpower reproduction as well. Contacts between kolkhoz members and the urban population are intensifying in other directions as well. In the final account, the intensification and expansion of activities between the kolkhoz-cooperative and the whole-people sectors strengthen and develop the socialist content in the production relations of the kolkhoz-cooperative sector and their consistent subordination to the requirements of the supreme objective of the socialist production process.

On the social level this means that at the mature socialist stage as well the working class remains, as the subject of relations, the leading power in public production. "...Objectively, the need to preserve and intensify its decisive role in the organization of public labor objectively arises and is steadily reproduced in the working class..."(V. V. Tsakunov, p 31). This need is based on the expanded reproduction of relations within the property of the whole nation and is consistent with society's advance toward the communist forms of labor organization. On the one hand, the kolkhoz peasantry reproduces its kolkhoz-cooperative forms of labor organization; on the other, it becomes increasingly involved by the working class in interfarm cooperation and agroindustrial integration, for this is consistent with current economic interests and the future development of the kolkhoz peasantry and its advance to the higher communist phase under the guidance of the working class.

Naturally, the unity of economic interests shared by the friendly classes does not exclude differences. One of them, in our view, is the different attitude toward the problem of accumulations. Unquestionably, together with the working class the kolkhoz peasantry is interested in improving the material and technical foundations of the production process. However, this goal may be attained also primarily through the accumulation of the kolkhoz added product or the added product of the entire society. The combination of these sources of accumulation varies with the development stages of socialism.

In studying the leading role of the working class in strengthening the social homogeneity of Soviet society all researchers have noted processes such as the



predominant and increasing share of this class in the country's population; the latest labor tools and technological processes it creates and services, which determine the logic of the development of the social productive capital as a whole; and the high cultural and technical level it has reached. These processes have been studied for quite some time, and statistical data are regularly issued for some of them, including the number of workers and their share in the country's population (including non-working members of their families), the number of workers with higher and secondary education (complete and incomplete), the dynamics of capital- and energy-labor ratios in industry, etc. Socialist competition, the movement of rationalizers and inventors and various forms of participation in production management and social activeness, which set the standards for the kolkhoz peasantry and the intelligentsia, are extensively developed among the workers.

Objective socioeconomic processes are the base of the high cultural and technical standards of the workers. As V. M. Kuznetsov notes, "The growth of public production requirements regarding the training of the participants in the labor process is an economic law common to all socioeconomic systems" (p 109). However, the nature, forms and degrees of satisfaction of this economic requirement depend on the nature and level of development of ownership relations toward productive capital. The increased social direction of the mature nationwide labor cooperation directly affects the scale and depth of the process of growth of the cultural and technical standards of the working class. The objective logic of development of labor tools and production socialization have made a general secondary education necessary for the professional training (rather than mastering a narrow skill) of workers who can service several specific types of similar equipment and processes. Since socialism is based on the establishment of a direct tie between all working people and the public productive capital, the realized need for secondary training of some detachments of the working class has acquired a universal nature under the influence of the full set of socioeconomic reasons and operates in public production at large, although its sources lie precisely in relations based on ownership by the whole people.

However, we must also note that the nature of this requirement does not lead to uniform means for its satisfaction such as, for example, acquiring it within framework of the general educational school alone. A secondary education may be acquired in a vocational school or in night school. The ratio between these methods, which is affected by economic and other reasons among others, is not arbitrary. Nevertheless, it is important that the need for workers with secondary education for the public production process be individualized as well, to be realized by every person. The free (in the social meaning of the term) tie characteristic of mature socialism between working people and productive capital, the enhancement of cultural and technical standards within one's profession and the conversion from servicing one set of equipment to another would be impossible without a general secondary education of all members of society regardless of their social status (worker, kolkhoz member). Without a general secondary education specific groups of people would be "assigned," to start with, one type of specific work or skill or another. This type of organization of the manpower reproduction process would clash with scientific and technical progress and the law of labor changes and would essentially hinder the development of production forces. A great deal

of available data (higher job skills, rationalization, etc.) confirm the high economic efficiency of the educational potential of the working people. As V. M. Kuznetsov notes in his book at the Dinamo Plant in Moscow, as a result of their higher cultural and technical standards, the output of workers (fitters-instrument makers) with secondary education is 25 percent higher than that of workers with the same skills but with an eighth-grade education.

However, although it contributes to strengthening the social homogeneity of society, this process creates some difficulties as well, for at the present time the growth of the level of general culture of the working people and their views on the desired meaning and organization of labor are outstripping improvements in the material and technical base of the production process as a whole. In many economic sectors the number of first and second grade jobs exceeds the number of underskilled workers, while the number of fifth and sixth grade jobs is lagging behind the number of highly skilled workers. As a result, on the level of the individual worker the fundamental socialist principle "from each according to his capabilities" is not always fully observed. A certain segment of highly skilled workers, who occasionally fail to find jobs consistent with their training show some dissatisfaction with their work. These processes affect distribution according to labor as well. Therefore, the strengthening of the leading role of the working class and the social homogeneity in Soviet society are by far not conflict-free as they develop under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution.

The Soviet researchers and GDR scientists believe that it would be unrealistic to rely in the foreseeable future on a substantial rapprochement between physical and mental, heavy and relatively light, and creative and monotonous labor based on technology, the changes for which require the accelerated development of machine building. In our view R. Bechmann and K. Graupner correctly point out that "The economic and social influence of the scientific and technical revolution on surmounting major disparities is not always the same; each higher level of labor mechanization does not automatically include stricter requirements concerning labor skill or improvements in labor conditions ((2), p 78). In a word, in the developed socialist stage as well the socioeconomic system retains and reproduces on a new qualitative basis the need for keeping the worker on the job for a certain period of time through organizational methods and material and moral incentives offered for primarily physical or mental labor. The intellectualization of physical labor has its technical limits and covers a relatively small range of workers. It has not developed into a mass phenomenon so far.

Such are the various aspects of the contradiction between manpower as the sum total of man's ability to work, shaped under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, and the level reached by productive capital as an object for the application of this ability, as it actually exists in the course of building a classless society. The mature socialist society is interested in advancing the production process for economic reasons, by increasing output, and for social reasons, by increasingly improving the satisfaction of the growing human requirements in the labor process. However, the limited nature of resources available to the economy demands in the intensive search for new solutions in the social turnover sphere that the greatest possible attention be paid to the shaping and development of labor collectives as a

whole, along with improvements in the material and technical production base, particularly in the formulation of social development plans. Here everything matters: the conscious choice of a profession, thorough theoretical and practical training, developing confidence in a professional career, a favorable psychological climate in the collective and the ability to organize one's leisure time rationally, in accordance with one's job. For it is no secret, for example, that a factor negative in terms of economic and psychological consequences, such as the inability to handle unfamiliar equipment, although similar to the familiar one is the consequence of the poor theoretical and practical training acquired by some vocational-technical school, training-production combine, technical school and VUZ graduates.

After work, the natural fatigue of the worker, caused by the intensive use of a group of muscles or the concentration of attention on a limited number of operations in the course of the working day, is by far not always and everywhere consciously balanced with other types of activity (sports, amateur art work, technical creativity, etc.). The social organizations of the working people, the trade unions most of all, can greatly contribute to upgrading labor standards. However, the organization of the necessary material conditions largely depends on social policy and on surmounting differences which go beyond the framework of individual classes, and resolving problems in accordance with the characteristics and interests of the various groups and strata in our society. Such an orientation accelerates the progress toward total social homogeneity and enables us to gain the necessary experience needed to resolve the socioeconomic problems of a classless society.

The party pays prime attention to the need to equalize social differences on the territorial level. At the present time they are largely related to differences in the class structure. This process is discussed in detail in (2). The authors provide a number of summations in their study of regional differences in the use of manpower resources and differentiation among social consumption funds in this connection. Let us particularly note the conclusion that, "Eliminating wage disparities is less important than increasing funds aimed at equalizing production and cultural and living condition disparities between town and country in terms of reducing social (regional -- the author) disparities between the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry" (p 120).

The minimal and maximal limits in the pace of such equalization must be theoretically determined in order to ensure the planned improvement of the social structure of Soviet society. In our view, subsequent studies should include a comparison between the dynamics of overall social outlays for the reproduction of kolkhoz and worker manpower and the dynamics of corresponding labor productivity indicators. This would enable us to determine more thoroughly the economic foundations for the rapprochement among classes and the speed at which this process develops.

The study of the works under review leads to the conclusion that the growth of social homogeneity is not conceived by the authors as straight and smooth, but one with clearly visible main features. The main current one is the elimination of classes. Under mature socialist conditions, "The development of the intraclass structure of the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry, based on scientific and technical progress and production socialization, leads to the



fact that these classes are gradually becoming socially homogenous" (V. V. Tsakunov, p 181). Our society's socioeconomic development creates the necessary prerequisites for the total economic merger between state and kolkhoz-cooperative ownership within a single ownership, precisely on the basis of which the classless structure is established.

All the works under review agree that the building of a classless society within the framework of mature socialism is not the equivalent of reaching total communism. The social differences among people, in terms of the nature and content of labor (based on the composition and structure of skills used) and the volumes of consumption remain. In this connection, the study of the content of the "social homogeneity" category, its place within the conceptual system of the social sciences, etc., is of practical interest. Unfortunately, these aspects are not always suitably considered in published works. Nevertheless, the presentation of the theoretical information in a specific logical sequence and some of the conclusions indicate that both the works under review and other publications view social homogeneity as a general communist process with different levels of maturity reached at each separate stage: The elimination of exploiting classes, the establishment of the kolkhoz peasantry as a socialist class and the organization of relations of cooperation and mutual aid between the working class and the peasantry, the elimination of major disparities between friendly classes, the shaping of a classless society based on the ownership of productive capital by the whole nation, and the reaching of full social equality (full social homogeneity) through the elimination of social disparities between industrial and agricultural and mental and physical labor. In other words, the development of a single socioeconomic foundation for communism -- the social ownership of productive capital -- and the changes in the social structure based on such ownership are consistent with the single scientific concept of "social homogeneity."

We can easily see that this approach logically requires the study of the correlation between two concepts: "social homogeneity" and "social equality." We speak of "complete and incomplete social equality" and determine their meaning through the analysis of socioeconomic factors (universality of labor, collectivism and mutual aid, increased well-being, etc.), which are frequently combined under the concept of "growing social homogeneity," i.e., the two concepts turn out to be identical. In our view, therefore, the claim that "social homogeneity as a concept concretizes the broader social category of 'social equality' on the level of the social structure of the society and in accordance with the characteristics of its elements under socialism and total communism" (V. V. Tsakunov, p 17) is not unquestionable.

Since socialism is the first phase of communism, social equality must be specifically relative to the structure and interrelationship of its elements. Naturally, the unfinished nature of the discussion makes it possible to express other views on the content and functional role of said scientific concept. In this case, however, it would be methodologically correct to study social homogeneity in connection with the stages in building socialism.

Naturally, social homogeneity is closely related to social equality, a necessary prerequisite for which is the elimination of exploitation by expropriating the expropriators. This measure makes working people out of all members



of society and, as such, makes them socially equal. However, the working people do not become socially equal at any given stage: some work for socialist state enterprises, while others are private commodity producers who do not exploit hired labor. Therefore, the social equality of the working people during the transitional period has different socioeconomic foundations and forms of ownership of productive capital, with different historical futures.

The appearance of the kolkhoz peasant class gives the category of social equality a new meaning. The working people become equal not because they do not exploit others but because they reproduce themselves within the framework of the socialist farm and share in the socialist ownership of productive capital.

Under the influence of ownership by the whole people, the kolkhoz-cooperative form of ownership makes expanded socialist reproduction possible. In other words, the two forms are identical in terms of their historical future: both the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry are interested in communism. In our view, however, it does not follow from this that in the 1930s all social homogeneity elements had already taken shape in Soviet society. From the material viewpoint, as the subjects of production relations, the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry operated on the basis of the ownership of productive capital a substantial portion of which had come from the capitalist period and which, in a number of cases, displayed historically acquired features not based on the nature of socialism and class interests. During that period it was only the material-technical and organizational prerequisites for progress toward social homogeneity which were established.

Mature socialism is a different matter. At this stage, the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry, while remaining toiling classes, already operate on the basis of ownership systematically established under victorious socialism and the effect of its fundamental law and the law of planned proportional development. Correspondingly, a system of national economic proportions developed making it impossible for one class to appropriate without pay most of the added product created by another class for accumulation purposes, for this would involve a violation of proportionality and worsen the conditions under which the entire system of economic laws operates. Relations of comradeship and mutual aid in exchanging activities expanded between the two classes, encompassing all the elements of the two forms of ownership and becoming an economic necessity and the real foundation for the reproduction process. These and other changes are consistent with the scientific concept of "social homogeneity" which also characterizes the initiation of the process of planned and conscious shaping of a classless social structure. Its completion within the historical framework of mature socialism will prove that on the social level all members of society belong to the same group of owners of productive capital owned by the whole people. In other words, this will indicate that the existence of a relatively autonomous kolkhoz-cooperative ownership is no longer necessary for it hinders the development of productive capital and farm management methods. Therefore, the full well-being and free all-round development of all members of society will take place directly and exclusively through production by the whole people. The members of society will be equal not only as working people but also as owners of all productive capital.

These features, however, hardly cover the full current content of the problem of social homogeneity. The practice of building communism steadily raises new problems. In particular, in the light of the decisions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, we must profoundly interpret and summarize the impact of rayon agroindustrial associations on the development of kolkhoz-cooperative ownership and the pace at which it approaches ownership by the whole people. The measures formulated by the party equally apply to the private auxiliary plots which must also become part of the single process of production socialization, albeit in ways suitable to this element. Supplying such plots with farming tools, machinery and agro- and zooveterinary services must be paralleled by stricter social control over the use of productive capital, including land. In this connection, the study of the process of rapprochement between the working class and the kolkhoz peasantry in terms of size of income will also require the assessment of their income and expenditure structures in terms of the social significance of each element, both in order to strengthen social homogeneity and to ensure the comprehensive development of the individual.

As a whole, the books under review reflect certain theoretical achievements in the study of the process of establishing a classless society. However, the building of communism illuminates increasingly new facets of this problem, requiring the unabated attention of social scientists.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 120-124

[Review by Candidate of Economic Sciences S. Iovchuk and USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member Yu. Shiryayev of the book "Mezhdunarodnyye Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya Razvivayushchikhsya Stran" [International Economic Relations of Developing Countries]. In three volumes. I. O. Farisov, editor. Moscow State University Press, Moscow. Vol 1: "Foreign Economic Relations Between Developing and Capitalist Countries," 1980, 253 pp; vol 2: "Economic Cooperation Between Socialist and Developing Countries," 1981, 272 pp; vol 3: "Economic Cooperation Among Developing Countries," 1982, 296 pp]

[Text] Our party's documents provide a profound analysis of the process of the further development and intensification of the anti-imperialist and essentially national liberation struggle waged by the peoples at the present stage, in the aftermath of the collapse of colonial empires and the appearance on the world's map of almost 100 politically independent young countries. The successes of the liberation struggle and the gain of statehood raised the level of political consciousness in the people's masses in Asia, Africa and Latin America — the former colonial peripheries of imperialism — and enhanced their aspiration to develop their own national economies. The 1970s can also be described as the period of unrealized hopes of improving the economic situation of the liberated countries. Their trailing behind the industrially developed countries in per capital output is continuing to grow instead of diminishing. Unless this is stopped, according to some estimates, by the year 2000 it will reach a factor of 25, and the number of people living in absolute poverty in the developing countries will reach 1.3 billion (as against 800 million today).

The reason lies not only in the fact that the uncontrolled appropriation of the national resources of the former colonies and semicolonies by the imperialist powers determined the underdevelopment of their production forces and their economic backwardness but also that imperialism is continuing to this day to exploit the remaining periphery, but with the help of new neocolonialist methods. In remaining within the orbit of the world capitalist economy, the liberated countries inevitably experience the effect of its specific law of oppression and exploitation of the weak and the law of expanded reproduction of socioeconomic inequality. In the final account, this is the reason for the new wave of national liberation revolutions which broke out during the past decade, the appearance among such countries of yet another group which

selected a socialist orientation as its course, the demand for the establishment of a new international economic order and an increased counteraction to the imperialist policy which tries to shift the burdens of the economic crisis to the young countries. Hence also their aspiration to expand economic relations with the Soviet Union and the other members of the Socialist comity. This is a tangible manifestation of the qualitative distinction between socialist and capitalist international economic relations and the advantages which the former offer to the liberated countries.

The economics and politics of the developing countries and future relations with them have drawn the attention not only of specialists but of the broadest possible readership. The publication of the new monograph on this topic, prepared by the Institute for Asian and African Countries of Moscow State University imeni M. V. Lomonosov, with the participation of scientific associates and practical workers in many other institutes, establishments and organizations, was completed in 1982. For the first time in our country, this collective work provides an overview of the complex of international economic relations of developing countries.

The monograph's authors list among the most important changes which have taken place in the economic relations of these countries in the 1970s the full or partial nationalization of foreign petroleum concessions, and collective actions to set petroleum prices, raising them to an economically substantiated level which takes into consideration production costs, the non-renewability of this resource and the supply and demand ratio. This proved not only the increased dependence of reproduction processes in the global capitalist economy on the economy of less developed countries, which account for two-thirds of the world's petroleum extraction and nine-tenths of its exports, but shifts in the ratio among class forces in the international arena, which are making it possible for the liberated countries to counter imperialist diktat more successfully.

Nevertheless, in the area of overall relations with the young countries "the monopolies continue to dictate prices on the world market, imposing trading conditions to their advantage" (vol 1, p 6). Prices of basic export commodities of such countries (excluding petroleum) maintain, despite brief fluctuations, a persistent lag behind price increases of industrial equipment and other imported commodities. As shown in the work under review, price levels and ratios are influenced by a variety of factors. However, nonequivalent trade remains one of the principal tools of neocolonialism, the main prerequisites for which are the lopsided economic structure of the developing countries and the monopolizing of commercial markets by Western corporations.

The chronic foreign trade deficit of the majority of liberated countries is the consequence of low production development and the influence of unfair prices set on the world capitalist marketplace. Between 1971 and 1980 imports by these countries, excluding petroleum exporters, exceeded exports by a total of \$340 billion. The three-volume work traces this process which determined the increased foreign indebtedness of the developing countries (see, for example, vol 1, p 33).



Another aspect of the foreign trade of the young countries in the 1970s is equally important. The point is that during the past decade material resources worth some \$2.6 trillion were exported from the liberated countries, while imports, including commodities purchased with loans granted by the developed capitalist countries, totalled no more than \$2.2 trillion. In other words, between 1971 and 1980, by monopolizing commodity markets, holding controlling positions in the production of modern capital facilities, equipment and technology and retaining their hegemony in the monetary-financial sector, the imperialist centers extracted unpaid-for material resources from the economically weak countries exceeding \$ 400 billion. This amount is roughly the equivalent of adding some 25 percent to the annual overall gross product of the developed capitalist countries during the decade.

The authors' conclusions on the influence of political and economic factors on broadening the methods of neocolonial exploitation, the structure of capital exports in particular (see vol 1, pp 52-66) are of great interest. During the 1970s the volume and share of loan capital exports increased particularly, especially in the form of bank loans which are considered less risky than entrepreneurial investments. The indebtedness of the liberated countries increased from \$88 to \$626 billion between 1971 and 1982. Lending conditions became increasingly harsh, the share of "official aid" on easy terms dropped substantially, and interest rates on loans increased. The scale and degree of financial exploitation of the developing countries are increasing. Nearly half of the \$53 billion they received from the capitalist countries in loans and aid in 1977 were used to repay loans and interest on older loans, so that actual money transfers did not exceed \$27 billion. According to some data repayment of debts and interest absorbed about one-third of the nominal amount of credits or \$55 billion in 1980.

The aspiration of the Afro-Asian and Latin American countries to make use the influx of outside capital in order to resolve their economic difficulties and accelerate their economic growth is understandable. However, in this case they are frequently forced to contract for subjugating loans and to permit the uncontrolled activities of foreign companies, multinational corporations in particular, on their territory, for, as Lenin said, this is the price of the "tribute" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 183) one must pay for achieving some progress in creating modern production facilities and sectors and increasing production forces. Noting this, the authors also emphasize that foreign capital flows primarily into export sectors, including the extraction of petroleum, gold, nonferrous and ferrous metals and other types of mineral raw materials. In turn, this frequently creates new drastic disproportions in the economy of the liberated countries and triggers production and technological prerequisites for increasing their dependence on global markets. The authors draw the perfectly accurate conclusion that the opportunity to make use of foreign capital in accordance with the requirements of the national economy is manifested only under conditions of political independence and a governmental course aimed at protecting the national interests and giving priority to the mobilization of internal resources in order to overcome political backwardness (see vol 1, pp 61, 65).

The meaningful albeit short study of the historical experience gained in nationalizing foreign capital by the young countries completes the thesis that

the struggle has entered a new stage during which they will have to learn how to manage entire industrial sectors and to create new conditions for economic life, which would exclude the economic domination of foreign capital (see vol 1, p 75).

The declaration of the Soviet government in connection with the program for a new international economic order drafted by the developing countries notes that "The Soviet Union shows an understanding for this broad program of measures which reflect the vital long-term interests of the developing countries and supports its principled direction." A separate chapter in the monograph deals with this program which, despite a certain inconsistency, objectively reflects the need for the development of production forces which cannot expand within the framework of the neocolonialist system (see vol 1, pp 8, 163). The socialist countries support the democratic line of reorganization of international economic relations, while the imperialist forces, which are relying on promoting discord in the actions of the young countries and pitting them against world socialism, are stubbornly resisting this process.

In accordance with the economic declaration on the establishment of a new international economic order, which was adopted at the Fifth Conference of Nonaligned Countries, the young countries must begin by organizing extensive reciprocal financial, technical, trade, industrial and other forms of cooperation, use their "collective influence" in talks with industrially developed countries and observe "internal discipline" in the course of their economic development. The leaning toward mutual contacts among Asian, African and Latin American countries particularly intensified during the past decade, which was marked by crisis phenomena in the global capitalist economy and increased protectionist trends. The share of economic relations in the overall exports of the developing countries increased from 20 percent in 1970 to 25 percent in 1979. The process of setting up their own international economic organizations intensified as well. The third volume provides a complex study of economic relations among Afro-Asian and Latin American countries. We must point out that this is a first attempt at a comprehensive study of such an important area in international economic relations.

The sections on methods and results of the activities carried out by the liberated countries with a view to facilitating and stimulating foreign trade among them, ensuring close interaction in science and technology and engaging in joint actions on world commodity markets in mineral and agricultural raw materials are worth noting. Citing extensive factual data the authors consider efforts to develop regional and subregional integrated groups in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and the activities of the international banks and funds established by the developing countries.

Economic interconnections, including regional cooperation, facilitate somewhat the solution of economic and social problems facing the young countries. Mutual trade helps them to broaden their markets for processing industry sectors which have developed in individual countries and to reduce the acute commodity hunger felt by most former colonial nations. The scarcity of funds for the implementation of the economic development programs causes difficulties in the industrial utilization of accumulations. This is typical of some petroleum exporters. The more efficient and rational utilization of material,

manpower and natural resources by a group of countries may provide a favorable prerequisite for their industrialization and organization of a progressive economic structure. It can also broaden the possibility of implementing various projects on a multilateral basis (see vol 3, p 288).

The opportunities which economic interaction offers the developing countries cannot be fully determined as yet. One of the most difficult obstacles here is the strong positions held by the imperialist countries and the monopolies in the economies and foreign economic relations of many young countries. The production structure of the former colonies remains extremely narrow and, in a number of cases, one-dimensional. Foreign capital is doing everything possible to intensify and strengthen the dependence of their industry on relations with the industrial centers of the capitalist world and the global capitalist economy as a whole. Characteristically, in their efforts to expand further, the monopolistic giants are adapting themselves to the conditions resulting from customs unions organized by the developing countries. "The branches of multinational corporations operating in a given country enjoy certain benefits in neighboring countries as well as a result of reciprocal preferential systems established by the interested countries" (vol 3, p 26). Steps taken by the developing countries to streamline trade in raw materials and food-stuffs are frequently limited to foreign trade, hardly affecting the activities of foreign monopolies in extracting, processing and transporting the respective resources. It is not excluded that such measures "may result in no more than partial and temporary improvements in their situation while the main benefits go to those same foreign monopolies" (vol 3, p 114).

The role which the subjective factor -- their controlling activities in the field of foreign economic relation -- plays in the development of relations among young countries should not be underestimated. In our view, the authors' summation of the "foreign aspect" of the economic functions of the state is largely original and is one of the most important theoretical foundations of this entire collective work.

The influence of the subjective factor on cooperation among developing countries is manifested, among others, in the fact that the targets and mechanisms of action of the integration associations they have created so far have been based on and structured similarly to the free trade zones and customs unions of industrially developed capitalist countries. Given the predominance of marketplace mechanisms in this respect, differences in the levels of economic development of participating countries and their industrialization levels strongly influenced this process; increased gaps in development, the different interests of the partners in terms of export and import operations on world markets and outbreaks of economic and political quarrels made themselves apparent. The monograph proves that acquired experience, which helps the young countries to develop new concepts of economic cooperation, the essence of which is to shift the center of gravity in integration policy to the production area, has also increased their attention to planning methods and the experience in economic integration gained by CEMA (see vol 3, pp 33-34, 240).

The specific content of the policy of the liberated countries in the area of foreign economic relations, including the targets and methods of cooperation with neighbors, and the degree of restriction of the influence of foreign



capital on the national economy depend on a number of factors. In the final account, its nature is determined by the class nature of the political system and the directions in socioeconomic development. In this context we can speak of prospects for strengthening the unity and solidarity among the young countries on an anti-imperialist basis and their effective alliance with world socialism in the struggle for their rights.

The scale and geography of foreign economic relations are influenced by the objective need to develop production forces. Not the least important in this connection is the specific nature of economic ideology and the nature of the theories and concepts on which the state bases its actions in this area.

One of the merits of this collective monograph is that each one of its three volumes contains separate chapters on bourgeois theories on international economic relations with developing countries, which offer a thorough study of views related to this problem. Despite the differences in approaches and interpretations typical of bourgeois economists, their conclusions are aimed at imposing on the liberated countries a capitalist way of development, perpetuating their unequal status in the global capitalist system and preventing their rapprochement with the socialist comity.

The ideological struggle in the world arena has become considerably aggravated in recent years. One of its important sectors is the struggle for the hearts and minds of the people in the young countries. The familiar claims that the West and the East, i.e., capitalism and socialism (arbitrarily classified as the "rich North") are "equally responsible" for the disastrous situation of the "poor South" are part of the imperialist efforts to mount a mass ideological attack in this direction. Deceptions, such as identifying foreign trade organizations in the socialist countries with international corporations, are used. False computations are being whipped up to convince the people of the "ineffectiveness" of the economic aid which the CEMA countries are giving to the young states.

The rich factual and statistical data on the nature, organizational principles and results of the economic cooperation between socialist and developing countries, included in the second volume, lay a strong foundation for a substantiated rebuff of the falsifiers.

Noteworthy above all is the high level of influence which such relations have on the real progress achieved by the national economies of the young countries and their development of modern material production sectors. At the start of 1981 they had commissioned with CEMA economic and technical assistance capacities for smelting 9 million tons of steel and the production of 30 million tons of petroleum products and, power plants generating a total of 11 million kilowatts of power. More than 190 machine-building and metal-processing plants and a large number of other light and heavy-industry enterprises had been completed or were under construction, and tens of thousands of hectares of land had been developed. Such capacities account for 30-40 percent of the basic ferrous metallurgical products in the Afro-Asian countries and for a substantial share of output in other sectors. More than 70 percent of the economic and technical cooperation provided by CEMA to African, Asian and Latin American countries is in the state production sector, i.e., it is involved in



meeting the current tasks set in their national plans. Therefore, the overall results of such cooperation in terms of the economies of the developing countries substantially exceed those expressed in official data.

Let us mention that the prospects for increasing the volume and, respectively, the share of this trade largely depend on increasing exports by the liberated countries. The volume of such trade is currently limited because the export possibilities of most partners poorly match the import requirements of the socialist states and also because of a certain inertia in the pattern of their foreign trade. Unlike the leading imperialist countries, whose balance of trade with the developing countries is negative, the socialist comity delivers to these countries annually more material values than it receives in return. Thus, the overall 1980 commodity exports by CEMA countries to the young states totalled 14.2 billion rubles, exceeding imports by 2.4 billion.

The CEMA countries grant easy credits to the young countries with long repayment terms and low interest rates which, in most cases, do not exceed 2.5-3 percent per year (see vol 2, p 181). Understandably, the possibilities of the USSR and the other socialist states in helping the developing countries are not limitless. However, the real significance of such aid is quite tangible.

The authors justifiably emphasize that the possibility of developing relations with the socialist world enables the young states to defend more consistently their economic interests and hinders the imperialist monopolies in using against them the weapons of economic and technological blockade. Noteworthy, in particular, are the substantial results achieved in training national cadres in the liberated countries with CEMA help. This has enabled these countries to train a total of about 1 million skilled workers and graduate specialists. Some 50,000 of them were trained by the CEMA countries between 1971 and 1981 alone. Let us note for comparison's sake that between 1961 and 1972 some 230,000 skilled specialists from the young countries emigrated to the United States, Canada and Great Britain, as a result of which the harm this caused the young countries, according to UNCTAD data, is estimated at \$50 billion (see vol 3, p 136).

The monograph is noteworthy for the close attention paid to practical problems of economic cooperation with the liberated countries, particularly the study of the organizational-legal foundations of such cooperation (taking the USSR as an example), the activities of foreign trade organizations and the functions of sectorial ministries and departments in aiding the young countries. It also discusses the organizational-economic problems of aid to the developing countries through the UN and gives an idea of the structure and functions of international economic organizations in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

As a whole, the authors, some of whom are noted researchers and practical workers, have dealt successfully with the complex problems of such an overall study of the international economic relations of developing countries. This is not to say that the work under review has no shortcomings or unused possibilities. Thus, not all chapters contain sufficiently clear conclusions. There are cases of repetitiveness and some inaccuracies. The monograph should have perhaps included a separate chapter on the economic situation of the young states and their development programs for the 1970s and 1980s and

separate sections on the economic and foreign economic relations of socialist-oriented countries as well as on the experience of some CEMA countries in surmounting past backwardness. In the work, materials and summations on these problems are dispersed among several chapters, which makes their understanding harder. Concise statistical addenda based on representative data appended to the main sections would have been quite useful. This would facilitate the use of the material under circumstances in which new data appear steadily.

In conclusion, we would be fully justified in saying that a good and useful work with a great deal of original analysis of complex and occasionally contradictory processes developing in the area of international economic relations of developing countries has been produced. Quite naturally, this collective monograph has created a great deal of interest among economic scientists and practical workers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## CIA AND WESTERN EUROPE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 125-127

[Review by S. Golyakov of the book "Gryaznaya Rabota TsRU v Zapadnoy Yevrope" [CIA's Dirty Work in Western Europe]. Collection compiled by Ph. Agee and L. Wolfe. Translator from the English. Voyennizdat, Moscow, 1982, 288 pages]

[Text] Recently the Swedish press reported a sensational piece of news to its readers. The current Swedish prime minister had been kept under observation by the U. S. Central Intelligence Agency for some time. "For several years I had a CIA agent tailing me," Olof Palme said in an interview granted to the newspaper EXPRESSEN. The surveillance began toward the end of the 1960s, at a time when the Swedish public was actively protesting the dirty war waged by the United States in Vietnam. O. Palme, who was then minister of education and religious cults in the Erlander government, had participated in the protest actions, and the behavior of the Swedish minister had irked official Washington. The CIA was instructed to keep him under surveillance. A special agent, who had been his classmate at Kenyon College (Ohio) was sent to Sweden. His assignment was to determine Sweden's position regarding the United States through contacts with Palme himself and his circle.

It is noteworthy, EXPRESSEN points out in this connection, that the CIA agent was exposed not by Swedish security but by the prime minister himself. Why? The answer is given in the translated collection on subversive CIA activities in Western Europe, recently published in the Soviet Union. "The Swedish secret service," one of the articles emphasizes, "never went after CIA agents. From the CIA's point of view, it is an ally who will never block an operation. The CIA feels at home in Stockholm and fears no danger" (p 20).

The CIA feels at home in many Western European capitals. Political intrigues and conspiracies, bribing foreign personalities, dealing with objectionable individuals, secret financing of electoral campaigns, manipulating the press, economic espionage and secret instigations are only a partial list of the activities of Washington's resident agents in countries allied with the United States. Naturally, such activities are concealed behind slogans of the struggle against "the red menace" and "international communism," the common enemies of the international bourgeoisie. However, as Ph. Agee, one of the collection's compilers testifies, this is "the most persisting myth" used by the CIA to cover its interference in the domestic affairs of foreign countries. The myth is easily believed, for militant anticommunism is the very foundation of

U. S. foreign policy, which all American secret services must protect and serve. In CIA's case, however, the book emphasizes, gathering and processing intelligence data on the Soviet Union and its allies is hardly its only task.

The CIA, Agee testifies, remains above all "an action agency." Its range of interests lies between "striped pants diplomacy" and the landing of marines, and its targets in most countries are the same: governments, political parties, the armed forces, the police, secret services, youth and student organizations, cultural and professional societies, and mass information media. The CIA cultivates friends and routs enemies in each one of them, for the agency's permanent target is to secure U. S. hegemony and the opportunities of multinational companies to intensify the exploitation of the natural resources and working people in other countries.

The man who wrote this unquestionably knows what he is talking about. In his youth Ph. Agee, known to the Soviet readers from his book "Behind the CIA Curtain," was raised by the Jesuits as a fanatical anticommunist. He volunteered for intelligence work. He began to question everything in which he unquestioningly believed when he was assigned to CIA duty in Ecuador. It was there that he became disgusted with the people on whom his agency was relying most heavily: the cruel narrow-minded rulers, a minority which was inflicting its will on the country. Reassigned to Uruguay, Agee realized once again that the country was run by corrupt people on the make. The local elite was venal and depraved. Dozens of millions of dollars were being spent by the CIA to support this rotten bureaucracy -- the main hindrance to social progress in Latin America. A radical change took place in Agee's outlook and he took the path of open struggle against his spiritual mentors at Langley.

The collection under review is one of the milestones in this struggle. Agee and L. Wolfe, an American publicist, have included in the work documentary evidence supplied by American, British, Italian, French, Spanish and Greek writers published in the bourgeois press at different times. Such collected testimony becomes an angry indictment of those who have elevated naked thievery to a standard for international behavior.

The collection's topic is limited to the CIA and Western Europe. However, it is particularly important precisely because it is here, in the Old World, that the main U. S. NATO partners are located. Consequently, it is a question of secret operations on territories of countries united within the Atlantic solidarity movement. How is this treated by the CIA? Here are some examples.

In the postwar period, Greece became one of the most important targets of CIA attention. The agency had more than 200 operatives in the country during the 1960s. They used its territory to mount operations against countries bordering the eastern Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf and to work against the socialist countries. However, equal efforts were spent on secret interference in strictly Greek affairs, covering a great variety of topics, ranging from military aid and intervention in suppressing "internal troubles" to attempts at causing bodily harm to Andreas Papandreou, the then leader of the opposition, whom they tried to poison with a powerful drug, and giving CIA support to the "Black Colonels' " military coup d'etat in 1967.



As the collection shows, CIA agents were mounting a similar coup in Italy. An equally important role in these plans had been assigned to the Italian secret services which the CIA treated as its assistants. The CIA also cooperated most closely with various neofascist organizations which were linked with the overseas cloak-and-dagger knights through pathological anticommunism.

The activeness of CIA agents increased sharply in Portugal after the fall of the country's fascist regime. "In the Azores as in the mother country, the Roman Catholic Church, the political parties and even the armed forces, the CIA and its allies try to create chaos which would justify an attempt on the part of the so-called moderates to overthrow the revolutionary government," Agee wrote in a 1975 article (p 45).

What specifically was the CIA doing in Portugal at that time? Its main task was to penetrate the Armed Forces Movement with a view to gaining information about its plans, vulnerable spots and internal struggle, and identifying the so-called moderates and those who may be suitable for securing Western strategic interests. Other CIA assignments include the dissemination of false documents and rumors, stir up conflicts and rivalries and hold back the development of the revolution toward socialism.

Propaganda campaigns play a central role in all major political operations mounted by the CIA, we read in the collection. They are used in manipulating public opinion and promoting fear, uncertainty, indignation, enmity, division and chaos. In Portugal the CIA used the press, radio, television, posters leaflets and forged documents. The only "advice" which the CIA was prepared to give to the citizens of that country was on "how to make a counterrevolution," Agee notes (see p 51).

There is hardly a country in the entire Western European continent which the CIA has not tried to penetrate. According to one of the authors of the collection, in the 1970s Washington engaged in subversive operations against Great Britain, its most loyal NATO ally. Secret agents steadily watched the activities of the Labor Party and the progressive organizations.

In France Washington's agents are interfering in the affairs of political organizations, penetrating them with spies, trying to influence France's foreign policy and engaging in industrial and economic espionage. The CIA has penetrated deeply the French intelligence and counterintelligence agencies and recruited numerous informers within them, mainly through bribery.

CIA keeps innumerable full-time agents in West Germany. There are more agents here than anywhere else in Western Europe, for conditions for covert operations are particularly propitious along the banks of the Rhine. In addition to the traditional embassy cover, many CIA agents use the bases of American forces stationed in the FRG. The largest agency centers are in Frankfurt am Main, Bonn and Munich. The evidence included in the collection proves that the CIA is keeping its fingers tightly on the pulse beat of domestic policy in the FRG and neighboring countries and is trying to secure the inflexibility of its pro-American course and Bonn's favorable attitude toward the economic interests of overseas monopolies. At the same time, by supporting and financing numerous subversive anticommunist centers on FRG territory the CIA hurts

the reputation of that country in the eyes of the world's community and harms Soviet-West German relations.

Thus, in serving the U. S. imperialist course toward world domination, the CIA acts as the main instrument for interference in internal affairs and harming the national independence and sovereignty of other countries, including Washington's allies. The conclusion to which the readers of this collection are led is that Washington is firing at its "own people" as well. The authors reject out of hand the idea that a certain lack of control exists in intelligence work. All of CIA's activities are subordinated to the orders of the President or his national security adviser, they emphasize (see p 9).

Stained by numerous exposures and failures, the American intelligence apparatus became even more energized under the present administration. Suffice it to recall its efforts to compromise the powerful antiwar movement in Western Europe and its subversive activities against the socialist countries. Both past and present CIA dirty deals prove that this shock detachment of American hegemonism stops at nothing in the pursuit of its self-seeking objectives. One should never forget that it stops at nothing.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## SHORT BOOK REVIEW

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 83 pp 127-128

[Text] A. Yu. Urnov. "Politika YuAR v Afrike" [The African Policy of the Republic of South Africa]. Nauka, Moscow, 1982, 276 pages. Reviewed by Yu. Bochkarev and G. Starushenko.

The colonial empires in Africa collapsed under the pressure of the national liberation movement and 50 independent countries arose on their ruins. Colonialism was hurled back to the extreme south of the continent where the last and largest preserve of racism and apartheid -- the RSA -- remains as an actual jail for 26 million native Africans. It is a hotbed of militarism and aggression which threatens the independence of sovereign African countries. The South African ruling circles are a dangerous and treacherous enemy of the African peoples. Their expansionistic foreign policy is the extension of domestic racism. This is the topic of the book by A. Yu. Urnov, a noted Soviet Africanist. Using extensive most recent factual data the author offers a close study of the nature and origins of this policy and its role in global and regional imperialist plans, and exposes the objectives and motive forces of the ruling South African circles in the context of the sharp confrontation between the forces of progress and reaction on the continent. He skillfully combines the chronological with the problem approaches in his presentation.

Expansionism has always existed in RSA African policy in one form or another, the author notes. The country was still a British dominion when the local racists were already dreaming of "rounding up the boundaries of the South African state such as to reach the very heart of the continent" (p 12). The creation of the RSA only sharpened their appetite. Considering southern Africa a "natural sphere of their rule," they drafted far-reaching plans to create here a variety of economic and military-political blocs under their aegis.

In this connection a special role was assigned to Mozambique and Angola, the former Portuguese colonies, and to Zimbabwe. They were to serve as a kind of "cordon sanitaire" which would protect the RSA on the north from the rushing waves of the liberation struggle waged by the African peoples. As the book proves, the gaining of independence by these three countries made substantial corrections in the policy of the South African leadership. "Preventing the freedom fighters from using the favorable situation for comprehensively increasing their pressure on remaining colonial-racist regimes" (p 125) became its main task. The RSA tried to destabilize the regimes in Angola and Mozambique with a view to setting up their puppets in these countries. This policy was manifested most clearly in the RSA aggression against Angola in 1975-1976,

timed with the energizing of bandit activities by proimperialist armed groups run by the CIA. This aggression failed thanks to the internationalist aid which the USSR, Cuba and some other socialist countries gave to Angola.

By the end of the 1970s the South African racists engaged in yet another neo-colonialist venture: they formulated a plan for the creation of a kind of "constellation of countries in southern Africa" in which independent countries were to be reduced to the status of Bantustans or, simply put, domestic colonies. However, this project as well remained on paper only. The author concludes that "the Pretoria regime proved unable to implement the imperialist plans on the subcontinent. This led the main Western powers sharply to increase their interference in the African south with a view to assuming direct control over regional processes" (p 159). These powers always closely protected and comprehensively supported the South African racists, which is the main reason for the durability and aggressiveness of their system. This time, however, it was a question of a new stage in imperialist policy aimed at suppressing the national liberation forces operating in the area and destabilizing and bringing down the progressive governments in the independent countries.

Citing extensive data the author convincingly proves that the United States is the support of racism in Africa and throughout the world. It practices a racist policy itself; it refuses to ratify the convention on the abolishment of racial discrimination, already signed by some 120 countries, and is boycotting the second world conference on the struggle against racism, scheduled for this year. It is precisely the U. S. administration that has assumed the main role in the criminal conspiracy against freedom-loving Africa by declaring the RSA a "valuable ally" of the West. "The increased support provided by the United States," the author states, "encouraged the racists and allowed them to operate with greater intransigence and impunity" (p 257).

Hence the uninterrupted aggression conducted by the RSA against Angola and the occupation of some of its territory by South African troops, and the subversive and terrorist actions on the part of so-called "national resistance movements," formed and armed by Pretoria, in Mozambique. Hence also the maneuvers of the "contact group" headed by the United States, aimed at delaying the independence granted Namibia. The author cites excerpts from the statements of RSA Foreign Affairs Minister R. Botha showing the intention of the racists and their American protectors to reach a so-called "internal settlement" in Namibia, i.e., a unilaterally proclaimed independence and transfer of power to Pretoria's political puppets. "The RSA government does not want Namibia to take the wrong way," Botha proclaimed. "That is why it is prepared to take an expensive step such as war. We hope and pray that a government sympathetic to us will be formed there. Namibia's domestic political parties are unwilling to let us go before they have gained sufficient strength to control the situation. We want a black anti-Soviet government" (pp 240-241).

A. Yu. Urnov's book is a profound scientific study, the first of its kind in our literature to expose the underlying reasons for the events and processes leading to the formation of a dangerous hotbed of international tension.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1983

5003

CSO: 1802/11

END



**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

**June 17, 1983**